

COPYRIGHT WARNING

Notice: warning concerning copyright restrictions

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research." If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

SOME SPIRITUAL AIMS
FOR
MODERN AMERICA

BY
Paul Ronald Spann

Directed by Dr. William J. Wolf
Professor of Theology, Episcopal Theological School

A paper submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Divinity in the Episcopal Theological School
1970

To My Parents
In Thanks For Some Lessons In Detachment

FOREWARD (i)

What place do blackness and the modern Negro's struggle against injustice, Egyptian anchorites of the third and fourth Century Christian Church, the Jewish origins of that religion, the non-violence of Mohandas Gandhi and Martin King, and finally, though hardly least, the Holy Spirit - what place do all these have in an essay that is also going to attempt a re-evaluation of asceticism in Christian vocation? I will be concerned to relate all these matters in the following pages. This whole enterprise has a personal urgency for me, which accounts for one of the presuppositions here, that the experiential side of Christian life requires careful attention. I am concerned about man's personal encounter with God and with other men.

The overriding interest, however, is to discuss the Christian's spiritual trek to the desired end of resting with God in his Sabbath, to enter the New Jerusalem and go up to the feast of the Lamb, to dwell in Him as He in us. Yet it is because this is a trek, a journey outside the walls of Jerusalem, a deliverance by means of exodus, that elements of a "sterner" quality must be weighed. This is the only legitimate sense of sternness as often attributed to Christian asceticism, even the state of celibacy, for in the end, the ascetical spirituality of a Christian must open his life to the unrestrained flow of love as it triumphs over the destructiveness of sin at all levels of life.

By definition, then, spirituality must be life in the Spirit. For as we experience the Spirit, "getting turned on", we encounter God personally. The direction of our life ever after is to seek the total appropriation of the Spirit by surrender to the will of God. This is the traditional content of ascetical language, but I believe that today there is place for a new exploration of that language. The fact is that the exploration has already been under way in the name of such diverse men as Gandhi, King, and Roger Schutz. Already others arise to take their place as the truth to which they witness reveals itself more and more. In those three names alone one has a nutshell history of modern strivings against class and racial oppression, the drive for the peaceful integration of races and nations, and the quest for the unity of the Body of Christ.

There is, moreover, another program hidden in this effort. On my wall there hangs a calendar published by La Causa, the Mexican-American organization of Migrant Workers. Its leader, César Chávez, stands next to Ralph Abernathy in the photo accompanying the May calendar. Beneath the photo a caption quotes a line of Ovid: "We two form a multitude." That in itself is a clue to this thesis, that stunning understatement of the history of passion, glory and destiny incarnate in those two persons. As I have researched some of the material I will be discussing, I have found myself led back across history to what I would call the Third World origins of Christianity, at a time when the self-awareness of the Third World (in which I would include my own Afro-American brothers and all oppressed and indigent of America) is in the ascendant. Coming as this does in the midst

of a deterioration of much of traditional Western culture, the historical cycle by which a multitude in quest of its liberation from death and misery is brought face to face with a Redeemer born in its midst, as it were, a Non-Western hero, bears tremendous implications. In that origin the history of asceticism is inextricably caught up and for that reason alone commands our attention.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Before the reader embroils himself in this essay, I would like to apologize beforehand for the construction of the second and third chapters in particular, but generally of the whole essay in that I did not make provision for sub-headings. An inadequate compensation has been made in the outline-form given to the table of contents. The second chapter is perhaps three since it covers three distinct periods, but I hope that the numeral divisions will help signal this.

This essay was written under the direction of Prof. William J. Wolf and Dean Harvey N. Guthrie, with both of whom I was privileged to do much preparatory reflection. The decision to write came at the urging of Dr. Wolf, and in a way is an outgrowth of work done in a course under him two years ago, in which the excitement of Maurice was opened up to me. At the same time I was studying under Prof. Herbert W. Richardson, author of the idea of an American theology, and the person who opened up the

the theological world of M.L. King, Jr., to me in that fateful spring, and many of whose far-ranging ideas I feel have become somewhat indelible. I owe Prof. Lloyd G. Patterson inexpressible thanks for bibliographical aids and historical enlightenment, and Prof. C.W.F. Smith who in tutorial and course work has helped me wrestle with some exegetical issues. The Rev. Robert A. Bennett also supplied bibliography. I am forbidden to name another friend under whom I read and translated from Theodore of Mopsuestia and many Pauline excerpts, but I will pay my vows of thanks unto the Lord for so good a soul. Thus I am responsible for any errors or distortions in the following text.

Finally, now that I am reminded of how much that is not me has gone into this essay, I want to express wonder at all the friends who have suffered my overabsorption with the following topics. Those repeated conversations helped me reach many articulations. The men of Cowley and Holy Cross have my thanks for their sharing an interior life with me that deserves all admiration. And where or who would I be without a company of soul-brothers whose buoyancy kept me at the typewriter? Finally, last minute thanks go to the angel of mercy who typed these pages - *thanks* and chapter three.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1. Foreword and Acknowledgements	i
2. Chapter I: A Background	1
3. Notes to Chapter I	29
4. Chapter II: "Third World" Spirituality in Scripture and History	330
I. A. American Religion As Kingdom-Oriented	
B. The Basic Philosophy Is Sociological	
C. King and Classical Atonement Theology - Some Presuppositions	
D. This Theology Illuminated by the Prophetic Tradition	
II. The Holy Spirit	
A. Obstacles to Discussion - Theological	
B. Obstacles to Discussion - Exegetical	
1. OT - Spirit of Prophecy, Holiness, Righteousness, etc.	
2. NT - The Virgin Birth	
3. Critical Problems in the Virgin Birth	
4. Typical Solutions - Creation-Messianic Motif	
5. A Rebuttal: the Spirit As Personal; the Spirit of Creation and Holiness	
6. God-With-Us	
7. Toward Clearing up Some Confusions: to <u>genommenon hagion</u>	
8. The Palestinian Christology and Pneumatology of the Gospels	
C. Observations on Luke and Some Extracanonical Features	
1. Jewish Christian Trinitarian Speculations	
2. Angelology	
3. Asceticism - Virginity and Poverty	
D. The Category of Prophecy	
1. Jesus As Prophet - the Spirit's Indwelling	
2. The Person of Jesus	
III. The NT andnLater Palestinian-Related Developments	
A. Antiochene Christology - Theodore of Mopsuestia - "Indwelling" Christology	
B. The Sources of Theodore's Pneumatological Christology - Jewish Christianity	
1. The Ebionites	
2. The "Orthodox"	
C. Monasticism	
1. "Old" Views	
2. "New" Views - Martyrdom As the Background	
3. NT Background of Martyrdom	
4. The Geographical Setting	
5. The Content of Desert Spirituality	
IV. A Synthesis - from the NT to Today - a Shape of Worldly Holiness	
5. Notes to Chapter II	111
6. Postscript to Chapter II	119
7. Notes to Chapter II Postscript	130

(Continuation of Contents)

Page

7. Chapter III: Guidelines for an American Spirituality - "He has Put Down the Might from Their Seats..."	131
I. The Task of Spirituality	
A. The Destiny to Glorify God	
B. Holiness in the World - Continuing Christ's Work	
C. Recognizing the World	
D. The Spiritual in the Heart of the World	
1. Power - a Definition	
2. The Use of Power	
3. Spiritual Force	
II. The Content of Spirituality	
A. Repentance and Forgiveness - then Need to Worship	
B. From Justification to Vocation	
C. Vocation - Justification - Response	
III. Growth in Holiness	
A. The Need for Community - a Work of the Spirit	
B. The Spiritual Gifts - the Charismata: the Enjoyment of God, Edification, Authority	
C. Community, Charisms and Eschatology	
IV. Spiritual Behavior	
A. Asceticism as Detachment	
1. Property and Power - Poverty	
2. Chastity	
a. purity of motive	
b. sexuality - marriage and celibacy	
c. Anger - Non-violence	
3. Obedience	
V. Conclusion	
8. Notes to Chapter III.	177
9. Bibliography	179

CHAPTER I

My interest in writing this essay arises out of a growing perception of God's demands on my life, and of how I am to respond to that reality. When one looks for his vocation, the state in which he is called to live out the implications of the history that is his, then the response to reality's demands has been sparked. One is born into a family history, for instance, and not only that, but he is born also into a racial, a national, and a terrestrial history. Of course, such background elements do not simply pass into one's life like so many materials collected in a laboratory. Life is not experimental in that sense. The same elements can be stripped away by accident, by conscious repudiation, or, by similar accident or knowing choice a person can weave uncommon threads from other histories into his own existence, somehow making them his own. The Christian will admit as well to a sense that God lays claim to the whole of his history, relocating and adapting him to an entirely new organization of all history. That is the vocation of the Christian in the communion of saints and the Kingdom of God. Of a sudden the history of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob becomes for Ruth, Cornelius and for every one who enters into it their own history. Theirs in turn becomes part of the others' because such history extends itself beyond ourselves in time and space in every direction.

There are a number of significant speculations about what

I am calling history. Existentialists of every variety insist on one's recognizing that at the personal level life rises above the sheerly accidental. Authentic existence happens as one reaches out in freedom to nurture his consciousness through action. That ascent is an aspect of history as I mean it here. Viewed only at the individual's level, however, this could be a cut-throat affair. Jean-Paul Sartre sketches precisely that problem when he declares that the (history-making) action of revolutionary man, especially as he reacts in violence, reveals man in the process of self-creation.¹

I do not think, though, that one must wait till such moments to identify the beginning of history, or existence. In the writings of Teilhard de Chardin the notion of thresholds suggests another attitude toward the rise of conscious existence. While there is much confusion about Teilhard's ideas of cosmic evolution, I think it is fair to include him in a summary like this one. Put simply, the history of consciousness does not go back merely to man's ancient or pre-history, but must be followed to the very springs of creation. With every reorganization of matter, however, from the primordial elements to complex molecules, from those to organic matter, from that to life, and from elemental life to the rise of animal consciousness, thresholds of consciousness are being crossed. History is being made. Once consciousness crosses over to its human expression, the new development is that evolution directs itself from there on. The underlying mystery (and the critical problem it generates) has to do with how this evolution, as Teilhard describes it, is a free process, though nudged across its

thresholds by Providence. For Teilhard the evolving complexity of consciousness corresponds to my definition of history. The remaining important feature is that this progression has a destined locus--in God.²

Another example of the modern preoccupation with the interweaving of histories lies in the growing social and cybernetic sciences. Perhaps these represent the new expression of consciousness as predicted by Teilhard. The new alchemy, as it has been called, dreams of eliminating social (and now ecological) conflicts by harmonizing in one global system the life of the most isolated individual and the most galvanized state. It is the dream to eliminate totalitarianism, to do universal justice, to eliminate conflicting interests while apparently multiplying to infinity the number of choices a man can make among tangible and intangible goods. All this is to be achieved without violating anyone's integrity--a universal welfare creation. It is the attempt to interrelate all histories consciously.

Modern piety also has a dimension to add to this notion of history. Exegetical studies have demonstrated the theological significance of the difference of meaning between the two Greek words for time encountered in the Scriptures. Chronos means simply the calendar time, the relative unit of measure we use artificially to mark off the passage of time as a highway milestone measures off distance. Kairos, however, indicates timeliness--the fulness of time, by which we try to measure significance, as we use the word "milestone" metaphorically to describe highlights of one's history. One popular writer makes the following distinction between the two times:

When I go for a walk in the morning, I notice the time at which I leave the house: 8:45, for example. That is chronos. Together with 9:10, it makes up the chronological coordinates of my walk. It is time as it can be plotted and drawn on a mental map. . . . But real time, high time--kairos, season, opportunity, chance--is not trapped within the coordinates of the clock. It does not answer the minor question: What time is it? It goes straight to the major one: What is it time for?³

Any talk about vocation is a talk about kairos, the high time at which one is called. The New Testament churns with the spirit of kairos, the time of the Messiah, and has consequently posed hard chronological puzzles for modern exegesis. By the same token the chronology of Tiberius Caesar and Pontius Pilate have been transfigured into an irreversible significance by kairos. As I reflect on my vocation, for example, I may hope for a similar transfiguration of my chronology as a twentieth century black, of my genealogy as an American descendant of black Africans. The transfiguration begins with God's claim on my history, and from the time I actively seek clarification of that call. That accomplished, I can adapt the implications of the history that is mine uniquely while journeying to the Source and End of all vocation, the God of Love.

Since, as I have said, this essay is largely personal, though hopefully not obtrusively so, I would like to complete this section with a discussion of certain problems which in my experience it has been necessary to isolate before any talk of vocation can make sense.

As a youth I never ceased to muse over what is at first glance a specifically religious controversy. For some reason, I could never be at ease with the traditions of Protestant piety, and ⁱⁿ the Episcopal Church in which I was raised I found myself clearly drawn to its "high" tradition. The Protestant-Catholic

polarity so dear to the ambitions of Anglicans of different schools had only one real meaning for me, and this had precious little to do with ceremonial matters. What it meant to a curious young black was, what was the proper anthropology? In Protestant piety sinfulness has been given such overwhelming significance as usually to vitiate any effort to restore man to his lost dignity. I remember reading J. S. Whale's Christian Doctrine, Barth on the Apostles' Creed, the Prayer Book articles on free will and justification, and a good deal of gloomy Puritan history. While these recapitulated mostly bookish issues of another age, the tradition of piety engendered in them casts shadows over our own times, and not simply as the generally decried fussiness of Puritanism, as I hope to show.

Perhaps more than anything I was anxious to know what to do with guilt. Somewhere along the way I came to intuit that the general social attitudes a Negro faces were related to these religious problems. Take, for instance, the rejection of any interpretation of man's moral activity which defines it as having redemptive value, based on the works-justification argument. This pious attitude has had deadly secular implications. It sanctions great social and political evils, particularly racialism. If socially one white man can make another into an indentured servant, while piously calling himself and the other alike "utterly depraved" creatures, then it is but a short step to making a slave of a black man, and calling him an animal. This requires an investment of sorts in man's sinfulness and guilt. It hardly accounts for the psychology of racism, but it touches one vital fiber of it. There is no mistaking the analogy between the position of man before God in Protestant piety and that of a black, red or brown man in the sight

of Anglo-Saxon Protestant society. The "guilt" of inferiority, of not being white, irrational and irremovable, makes it impossible for the racist mind to conceive of a reconciliation of the races somewhat as Protestant orthodoxy cannot imagine a modification of man's fallen condition (depravity) to be susceptible of cure and reconciliation to God. Either way man is stripped of any dignity, moral or social, even if he is one of the elect. He is only accounted righteous; there is a lingering grudge against him!

The social sciences, I was to discover, have come to a more active stand against the problem of guilt. Scientific social criticism has been spurred on by the monstrous assault of mass society on the individual's integrity in modern times. The modern world has entertained itself in the past few decades with spectacles of holocaust and sheer oppression, and so the social scientists have had unprecedented access to "field-laboratory" situations to base their studies on. Bruno Bettelheim, himself a prisoner of a Nazi concentration camp, turned his captivity into an occasion to study the effects of totalitarianism on the individual's personality. The success of totalitarianism, he discovered, whatever its form, depends on a successful inculcation into the oppressed person's mind of inferiority feelings, and an irrational sense of guilt (simply for being who he is), and on that person's interiorization of the oppressing group's or state's values. As for inferiority and guilt, the popular writer Paul Tournier, in discussing the anxious character of inferiority feelings, has written that all inferiority is experienced as guilt.⁴ Bettelheim in turn, analyzing the destructive effects of totalitarianism on the human soul, predicts that the behavior of the oppressed, who as men are still not

ants, though weakened and irresolute because of the force crushing them, are led by the mass state either "to a dangerous inertia or to explosions of instinctual violence."⁵ This violence could even be regarded as the last evidence of human tenacity to survive in spite of its origin in desperation.

When I first read those words of Tournier and of Bettelheim, it was the spring of 1963, and civil rights demonstrations in Birmingham, Alabama, had erupted into a brutal confrontation of police with the non-violent demonstrators. At about the same time I had been reflecting on the reluctance I felt to engage and oppose whites over the issues of racialism while at the same time my whole being spurned acquiescence to the demeaning ways of indifferent or hostile white society. Inevitably the two focuses of my study, the psychoanalysts' writings and Birmingham, came together as an insight. They provided me at least a temporary answer to what much of the reluctance I described of myself was about at the same time that they opened my eyes to the greater dimensions of what was happening in the streets of Birmingham. Rising from his acquiescence, the black man was discovering that there was nothing for which he was being accused by his oppressors to feel guilty about. He was no ant. There began to dawn in my mind an articulation of why and how to combat the acquiescence to which I tended--as a black person, but also as an ordinary human being.

Even while admitting that psychotherapy alone is not enough to perfect society, Bettelheim nevertheless defends the good which scientific advancement towards understanding and improving man yields:

External progress . . . is often overlooked by those who hold pessimistic outlooks on the future; their a priori low estimate of man and his potentials keeps them from realizing that from the time he became a social being, man has been meeting this problem . . . successfully.⁶

That kind of declaration goes straight to the heart of the issue about human nature raised in terms of religious doctrine, as we have seen above. Bettelheim is trying to establish a case for imperfect and troubled man's curability, if not his perfectibility, suggesting that it is necessary for human existence to overcome the alienation and injury to which human nature is constantly subjected. There is a therapy which consists in both removing the tyrannical structures over existence and refurbishing damaged ego and dignity, and to which man is capable of responding. This therapy insists on the restoration of autonomy to the individual, who must have control over the decision-making processes relating to his survival in order to develop as a normal human being. Likewise, one learns how not to surrender his autonomy. (In this interpretation one encounters again the theme of history which began this chapter. Here history means the healthy, autonomous development through decision-making processes that puts men on equal footing in society.)

During the intensification of the early 1960's civil rights drives, I, like perhaps every American Negro, watched, internalized and responded to what Martin Luther King and the army of civil rights advocates were contributing to the therapy of black and white America's soul. The importance of that phenomenon as it relates to this paper lay in its reinforcement of the American blacks' tenacity to attain dignity by waking him to an irrevocable sense of his native worth. The lies of white racism began to crumble before

the civil rights challenge, and to lie exposed for ever. In short, this marked a maturing sense of vocation, a feeling for the emergence of a particular kairos. It also marked the beginning of the spread of militancy (and chauvinism) through every rank and file of the black community as it exposed and confronted over the past decade the whole range of American racist structures in and out of the South. It was an ascetical awakening, as we will have occasion to see later on in detail.

The controversies around civil rights also revealed in special depth the lag between secularist, scientific and literary social-criticism, on the one hand, and religious social-criticism on the other. As I implied above, more often than not the former has been more positive--with no loss of realism--in its attitude toward human nature than traditional Protestantism. It is important to see here, through my exaggerated separation of religious beliefs and social attitudes how Protestantism's low view of man leads directly to the aggravation and perpetuation of social evils like racialism. It tends to undermine the quest for dignity.

Exactly what is the shape of this alleged religious problem? The issue I am raising arches over several generations to the very Reformation, and its attempted solution of the dilemma in which Christendom found itself with the rise of modern secularism. The Reformation is often remembered as if the problem was strictly moral and religious, while in fact it was not. Nevertheless it is instructive to look at that era's formulation of certain of the issues, because, oddly enough, several have survived in mutated or archaic forms in the piety of today's Protestant orthodoxies, and also because the conflicts of sacred and secular,

of class against class and race against race survive so conspicuously in contemporary life. The dilemma still racks modern spirituality.

The theological and spiritual problem that the Reformation set about to solve began in the difference of opinion about human nature. The answers to the question are traditional and well known. Our concern here is to evaluate the by-products which the 16th and 17th century debates generated, namely, a damaged perspective on human character, and a weakened grasp of the spiritual and moral dimensions of all life; not to impute to the Reformers the frequent distortions of their doctrines that grew with the history of Protestantism. (It might also be pointed out that the problem hardly belongs to the Reformation alone. We are talking of post 16th century Western society in general.)

The religious problem of the Reformation was to state accurately how man was to escape the tyranny of sin. The invaluable insight the Reformers reached was that a Christian can never forget his total dependence on God's initiative for that deliverance, and that the forgiveness of sins won by that redemption has so costly a price as cannot justly be revered by a piety which detracts from the uniqueness of Christ's work. The safeguards of this insight had to include witness to the Revealed Word of God and confession of man's justification as by faith alone. It is hard to say whether the Reformers so emphasized God's graciousness that confessing man's total corruption necessarily followed, or so emphasized man's loss of an original righteousness that it necessarily followed to exalt God's total otherness. Whichever is the case, it is quite clear that the Reformation held there

to be a radical break in man's relation to God, the loss of the Maker's image in man's soul, and the consequent inapplicability of any analogy between the Divine and created natures.

This complete loss of analogy, this annihilation of human dignity, meant, for instance, that revelation had to be described on a totally new basis, and on it a new interpretation of the Word was constructed restoring to it a prominence it had lost in Western Christianity. Revelation now had to be understood to come in connection with the gift of faith and justification, that is, only on the condition of God's prevenient and revealing grace. In the mind of the Reformation, and of most of its succeeding heirs, this notion of revelation precluded the possibility of a natural theology, since it was objected that any concession to reason alone detracted from God's initiative in the act of redemption. At the same time there began an extensive reduction and revision of the significance of pious behavior (e.g., asceticism). While learning to "sanctify the natural" by discarding the medieval rejection of the natural creation and a religion of abstinence and self-immolation, the Reformation lost interest in a visible Church society as essential, spurned an extensive sacramental system, repudiated the idea of a Eucharistic sacrifice, ascetical spirituality, and made the Word and Justification its bywords.

Why did the Reformation seem to discard so much? Whether the original Reformers intended to do so is something that cannot be answered here, but that such vast modifications had taken place in Protestant religion by the end of the 17th century cannot be disputed. It remained for later ages to suffer the devolution of many of the more negative beginnings. The extreme suspicion of

"harlot reason," for instance, virtually led to the abdication of non-theological knowledge to the philosophers--new, natural, and otherwise. So very often this also meant the retirement of the church from any social or political arena. The doctrine of justification finally seemed to proclaim only a change in man's relation to God, but nothing of a real change in man himself, which somehow seemed to imply that man--and by extension society--was so incurably sinful that God accepted him that way, and that God's grace consisted in accepting such a miserable creature. The denial of metaphysical statements about a visible church society and a sacramental system implied that there was really no therapy to give man autonomy from sin's tyranny, and no possibility of working at the construction of righteous society. Similarly, the reign of Christ seemed to apply only to the Church, to "redeemed" society, and not always to the full scope of a fallen cosmos. The lack of any natural capacity for revelation limited man's experiences to the Word, which has sent Protestants scurrying ever since to dissect even the New Testament in search of the true Word, the one word which could not be said to be in conflict with the priority of Christ's initiative in redemption. If it did not come from The Word, it could not merit so much attention. Hence, just as there was no principle of revelation by which to appropriate (historically) later developments like sacramentalism and a visible church, there developed no hermeneutical principle by which to appropriate the later insights of the New Testament itself, so that beginning with Luther on the epistle of James, on down to Dibelius, Bultmann and Perrin there has been no way of genuinely appreciating such material as the deuterio-Pauline or the Pastoral epistles.

They will always remain suspect; only the words of the Word--if one can find them--will do.

It is unnecessary to delay comparing such trends with the themes we have discussed earlier. A black man cannot long regard favorably a religious system which so lowers the aims of human dignity, and be comfortable. As an American Negro I have a real stake in the possibility of a visible, righteous society--righteous in more than just its drinking and smoking habits, that is. I cannot long have stake in an interpretation of justification that has an "investment" in man's sinfulness--and therefore society's--in order to glorify God's grace. This leads to Real Politik, to the lowering of aims for justice from total to proximate, and therefore to the deferment of my dreams of dignity. None can contemplate the brink of natural disaster at which the world stands because of abuse of natural resources and not want to find a principle of moral and spiritual authority to be asserted in favor of correcting such ills. If it is considered allowable and proper to apply a secular therapy that tries to safeguard human dignity and autonomy from the destruction of totalitarianism, how much more so should it be to have a religious counterpart by which the therapeutic power of Redemption by Christ may be confessed. The same Protestantism which developed democracy as a corresponding political means to protect the individual while religiously making the Word more relevant to personal life must now discover an even deeper relevance of that Word for human dignity, and also a higher and broader principle of application than to the mere individual.

Of course the reaction to do this set in long time ago. Luther, Calvin, Zwingli and Knox had their dissidents in Erasmus

Hooker, and seventeenth century "Platonick" Anglican divines. In the English speaking tradition, for which I can speak more accurately, the debate within Protestantism, in which Anglican high church ideals have often figured prominently, has been constant and heated. Usually in an antiquarian way, Anglo-Catholicism has been alert to the problems that have been cited. It identifies them by polarizing Protestantism and Catholicism (two ideals) as oppositions of the spiritual and the incarnational (in a restricted sense of the former), or of sacrament and word, and much scholarship seems to accept that as an adequate mapping of Christian spiritual poles. Gregory Dix (a hard critic of Cranmer and Luther) and John McQuarrie (a hard critic of Barth) have elaborated some of the best Anglo-Catholic critiques of Protestantism, but they also betray much of latter day high-churchmanship's failure to extend the issues to practical ethical level from the academic.

Other critics of pure Protestantism from a high-church point of view have been able to discover a more immediate application to practical living of their metaphysic. The typical emphasis in this case has been to regard the Church as an extension of the Incarnation, so that mission is understood to begin from God's own obvious concern for the natural order. Always, by opting for a higher notion of man's destiny, it is hoped to find a moral leverage by which to confront and transform the individual and the social order in Christ's perpetual embodiment in the Church Militant through her celebration of the sacramental mysteries. The importance of this approach is that while it has chosen to differ with the characteristic Protestant depiction of atonement, which could be construed to say that there was no ultimate reconciliation of man and God

because of man's allegedly irreparable loss of analogy with the divine image, high church sacramentalism also found how to cast its insights in language that was socially useful. The thrust was double--theological and practical (i.e., praxis).

John Sanderson, a critic of Calvinism and social "activist," was a seventeenth century spokesman of this tradition. In his own way it is true of Newman vis-à-vis Erastian England, and of Maurice vis-à-vis the ailing Protestantism of his day, and before the ugly panorama of Victorian social injustices. Writing still later Fr. Paul Bull of Mirfield sensed new tensions in the Protestant/cultural paradox (as Niebuhr calls it):

Protestants have learned to make the best of this world, to develop man's energies and capacities, hallow the home, to train man to high ideals of citizenship--in a word, to sanctify the natural.

On the other hand, Bull thought that faith in the miraculous was imperilled, as in the Virgin Birth and in the Resurrection, because of a tendency of Christians, especially Protestants, to base their worldly life more and more on "naturalistic" categories. This, he felt, was tantamount to losing feel of God's moral assertion over life. Still later, the social activist William Temple, an exponent of a visible Church society and a "natural" theologian, was to venture criticisms of Karl Barth's protestations against natural theology (which is not to imply that Barth had no interest in a moral witness in the world; quite the opposite! The prominence of such ideas in his theological writings, however, may be thought wanting). Another Mirfield priest, Trevor Huddleston, was expelled from South Africa for following in the tradition of Alan Paton by confronting South African Apartheid and repudiating the distorted Reformed

Church orthodoxy which has endorsed this social horror.

Nevertheless, sacramentalism and incarnationism have lost their force; it is worth noting how Anglo-Catholic influence has ebbed as the social issues have shifted, and how "old-time" Roman Catholicism has been undergoing extensive restatement. Part of the problem would seem to be a tendency of "high" ecclesiology to retreat from such broad issues to take up more particular concerns, as may be seen in some current ecumenical developments. Indeed, ecclesiology has often replaced theology, and whenever this happens it becomes extremely difficult to relate Christian faith to the world in which it is lived. There is also the tendency to divinize the Church by means of an over-realized eschatology. History becomes church history.

I may as well warn the reader of my feeling that the spiritual traditions bearing the richest lodes on which contemporary Christians can draw lie outside of Protestant and Western Catholic orthodoxy. This is why some forms of Protestantism or Catholicism have not been mentioned so far. On the inspiration of theologians like Herbert Richardson, Hendrikus Berkhof and Leslie Newbegin, I would prefer to explore instead the ancient and new spiritualities of asceticism, enthusiasm, and prophetic activism of Christians as distant in time^e-space as the first desert fathers, John Wesley and Martin Luther King. Their perspective on Christianity raises quite different issues about such things as man's nature, his revelatory and therapeutic experience. It has only been a kind of via negativa by which we have so far eliminated areas of concern in this introductory discussion of spirituality. Furthermore, there is one more area to cover critically before I can move on to my own con-

struction of terms for an apt modern spirituality and asceticism. Having reviewed some of the notions concerning the nature of man, it is necessary to go over some of the notions commonly held about sin and evil, that which causes the problems with which human life is fraught.

So many presuppositions abound about what is basic to healthy society and integrated individual psychology that one tends to think somewhat carelessly about the hard realities that frustrate and contradict those presuppositions. They include the desirability of sound mental and physical health, individual freedom politically guaranteed, and many other once pious ideals of benediction that have long since been secularized. Social experiments down through history have aimed at achieving such goals, and with the advent of modern technology it often seems that they lie much closer.

To date this experiment has been typically catastrophic, whether in the name of capitalism or socialism, of democracy or naked totalitarianism. Distributive justice diminishes yearly, as poor, "underdeveloped" nations give way to the rapine of or dependency on the richer, "developed" countries of the world, and the same pattern repeats itself within national boundaries. The poor are becoming poorer. Retributive justice goes unanswered in its protests against past injury, and against every offence newly committed. This is the protest not only of the black American, the red or Spanish American, or even of the oppressed of any other society, but also of the planet from which man has arisen only to plunder or trample it and its other life through human (over and against "natural") "totalitarianism." The widening recognition

of this last problem serves to undermine many of the older existentialist ideas of man's being fated to exist in a universe that is alien to him, or which apart from his consciousness is absurd. It is clearly a problem to be struck down from almost the entire Protestant tradition, and its general distaste for cosmological speculation. Rather than the interrelation of histories as a result of the great secular thrust, there is only alienation.

So sin and evil survive conspicuously in contemporary life. They are the impediments to history and raise the need for judgment on the experiments of man as he extends the adventure of evolution. The progression across cosmic, personal or societal thresholds does not unfold without wrinkles. Yet it is not enough to regard these bunglings as something shadowy, as the simple deprivation of what ought to be. If in fact evolution is a conscious enterprise, then the evil things its agents work must be considered as inescapably concrete. To state the matter in its barest terms, there are agents of evil. Some persons who would intend no great harm become agents of evil by making the selfish choices to which they are constantly tempted. There are still other individuals, however, who make evil the whole content of their existence, for whom evil is not just an occasional failure before temptation. The extortioner, the tyrant, and the racist all belong to this class. The usual consequence of their crime is to implicate other people by driving them into corresponding acts of theft, injury, murder, deceit and so on, assuming, of course, that the latter's existence is not crushed by the former sort of crime. Nor is this to overlook the inescapable malevolence of any human's behavior. Meantime evil tries to embody itself at ever higher lev-

els of organization--from individual to group to societal structures. Note that I am not discussing here the accidental harm that is truly unintended, and which in no way incurs blame. Evil begins with willful agency.

There is, then, this concreteness of evil as sin in and around oneself to be dealt with as part of everyone's encounter with life. The Christian traditions about the source of sin carry within a necessary agnosticism about its origins, but the most reliable depictions will always harp back to the fall of Satan, and to the description of the demonic powers in his league. In this light evil comes to mean that which is hostile toward God and his will, as well as towards his creatures, who exist by his will. There is John's Prince of This World, the Doctrine Devil who goes about like a lion, the Seer's vision of the wicked angels, or of the Dragon. The effect of these descriptions of the cosmic agents of malevolence, these enemies of God and tempters of man (who in turn produces his own share of demonic behavior) is to force one's attention on the active and hostile character of sinfulness and all the evil it generates.

The implication of this hostility is destruction. Death, it is clear, awaits the advent of moral evil into existence, sin being the active means by which evil is spread. And with the addition of death several other problems arise, such as tragedy, which is the only adequate description of the assault that evil and sin make on the native dignity of any good--its unwarranted destruction. This makes especial sense in the case of humankind, but a natural sympathy can extend the feeling of tragedy to the unnecessary destruction of any created thing (one of the great

moral problems being to define the "necessary"), if only by considering the common value of that thing to man's welfare. The irredeemable pollution of a pure water source, always a horrible crime in the desert, but now also for otherwise well supplied cities, suggests itself here. The reiterated theme of evil in both the Old and New Testaments is that it bodes doom that is constantly hemming man in. The history of salvation means being led out of such confining threats--redeemed, set at liberty--by God's perpetual promise to give life as he presses to fill creation with his glory. The quality of life (eternal), its abundance and glorification are the invitation held out to man and realized by Christ's sacrifice. In Christ death--and sin and evil--are conquerable. Their power to destroy is removed from man by God's mercy as far as the east lies from the west.

It should be noted here that the general meaning of the foregoing use of "evil" in isolation is ^{as} an impersonal and accidental ill. On the other hand by using "sin" I am trying to describe evil as an experience of malevolence or moral evil, and hence, an active versus impersonal distinction. Obviously evil in this sense may occur by self-infliction as well as by external agency. By this definition there is no necessary connection between death as the logical conclusion of a finite condition, and evil as wickedness, and yet the two can be most intimately bound together: "The wages of sin . . ." Either aspect of death gives rise to tragedy, however, as one learns from the experience of beholding death. I say that sin has no necessary connection with death since even if all evil were overcome in one's life, he would still face the problem of his finitude, and of the possibility of extinction.

Too often piety has tended to equate finite existence with sinful existence, in spite of the clue to the opposite inference one must make from the life of Jesus. The religious problem of Christianity is to live in struggle against sin--in and beyond oneself--so that death comes not as judgment but rather happens like the dying of the mustard seed, which must be sown and die to become the fruitful tree.⁸

Nevertheless, there is also another attitude within Christian thought that holds evil to be only illusory at most. Such a tenet is based on an older ontological view made popular particularly by St. Augustine, that the only reality is that of the Eternal, and so also the Good. The usefulness of this definition has made it an attractive solution for explaining the nature of evil, since in a negative fashion it thus becomes possible to exalt the good, but it always implies an ambiguity about the proper value of anything created and not inherently eternal. The obverse of this, of course, is that evil by contrast with good can only be thought of as non-existent. Conceptualizing sin as but the absence of good is the theological privatio boni so characteristic of Augustine, and a rally for much Western theology, Protestant and Catholic. The imagery of Augustine's writings is shot through with this notion: darkness as the absence of light, evil as the absence of good, and in his speculations about the relation of time past, present and future, the past is said to increase by diminution of the future, or that time is only as it tends toward non-being (e.g., time past or future). This was the mood not only of Augustine, but probably of most later patristic doctors who contributed to the growth of theology, especially those whose philosophical frame-

work was originally Platonic, and built on similar ontological presuppositions. Yet it was not the intent of Augustine or any of his later interpreters, who might have kept the form of the argument without the same presuppositions, like the Reformers, to play down the element of the demonic, of the concreteness of a satanic agency of evil.

The implications of the concept of evil as the privatio boni work themselves out only with serious practical consequences. In the area of piety, Christian spirituality ceases to be an ascetical (i.e., athletic) struggle against sin in oneself or in the world. Catholicism at one point has seemed set on removing the demonic to purgatorial horrors, while for Protestantism the demonic has often faded into the background as sin comes to be naughtiness. Socially the idea passed into what in modern times is the "liberal" assessment of evil. War is the absence of truce, or, more usually, peace is the absence of conflict--and nothing more. Poverty and hunger in twentieth-century America is first conceived of as pocket poverty--the haphazard absence of good. Western society's typical disregard for the misery of the underdeveloped world says in effect that such evil rises out of the absence of the goods of the developed world's culture. While these descriptions of social or religious evil provide handy explanations to the questioning mind, they do not communicate the whole truth of how this evil is experienced. Even here there are lapses, however, as of the political conservative who has a peculiarly demonic estimation of Chinese communism. In the communities of the dispossessed, on the other hand, the demonic has never ceased to threaten, nor has it been forgotten; the wielder of in-

justice is always a devil. Ask any black Muslim.

The most characteristic result of this understanding of evil is its gross underestimation thereof, which takes its heaviest toll on those who suffer because of evil. In contemporary American life this becomes the dispute between the militant leaders of the disenfranchised minorities and the generally more prosperous white majority. The accumulated disenchantment of blacks with liberal white support turns on this radically different assessment of reality. Blacks are accused of paranoia; whites are accused of indifference. What is clear is that whether paranoid or not, black leadership at no time has been able to rest in wait on white support of the struggle against injustice. If any black or other traditionally disenfranchised member of society fails to recognize the active threat of inimical forces against him, he stumbles into the costly error of what some of the existential psychoanalysts have called the illusion of reprieve. Under such illusion countless Jews marched into Nazi gas chambers clinging to the hopeless wraith that no real ill was about to befall them.⁹ Bruno Bettelheim observed in his concentration camp experience how the groups of humble, even despised origins in German society, like Jehovah's Witnesses, survived the ordeal with a greater sense of realism and resistance than the prisoners of traditional Protestant or Jewish middle-class background.¹⁰ So very often the person or group who seems least to possess any dignity reveals it in unfathomable depth as he defends his existence against everything opposed to it.

Such resilience~~ce~~ answers once and for all the question whether there is any meaning in life by emphatically standing

for the dignity that must necessarily precede meaning. The quest for civil rights during this century, symbolized by Gandhi, King, Chávez and others, shows forth the truth of the order dignity/meaning. It is hinted at in the distinction drawn between powerless morality and immoral power, which describes the struggle of the disenfranchised to strive for moral unassailability--a definition of their dignity--and then to seek its empowerment. This creates a necessary link between morality and power. Immoral power is the starting point and confounding of those who have forgotten the bond between dignity and power. I will return to this issue later on.

Lastly we must consider what Christianity answers to this survey of spiritual problems. How, in fact, is man to secure dignity and to withstand annihilation? There is no natural answer to the question, except, perhaps, to cultivate a genuine understanding of human freedom and individual worth. Man does have a native dignity, of course, and most political philosophy would attest to that. This much anyone can grasp. On the other hand the Christian is bound to ask a question about destiny. Has dignity no tendency? On the basis of the themes so far discussed--vocation, history, dignity and the improvability of individual and social life--one may imagine yes. The answer, however, will not depend on any evolution of human values, but on their conformity to the intentions of God, for which his unconditional help is needed. These intentions are learned through a comprehension of God's love. Evil as an impediment to history, as a diminisher of dignity has to be considered. The Christian hope to overcome such impediments rests in the Redemption wrought by Christ, through which the strength

flows by which the individual is also brought to victory. What is humbling and potentially dismaying is that there seems to be no exoneration from struggle for anyone, even after the achievement of Christ. Christian persistence, however, does have a principle of empowerment: life in Christ. In spirituality lies the clue to the Christian's destiny and to such matters as christology, and for this one must have knowledge of the Spirit.

How is the Spirit to be understood? The formula for the hypostasis of the Spirit with the Father (and the Son) was the last to be worked out in the trinitarian controversies. That fact reflects the general uneasiness which has characterized the attitude of probably every generation of Christians before and since the first ecumenical councils. Questions crop up such as, is the Spirit distinct from or dependent on the Son for its identity? One might even ask what is the appropriate pronoun for the Spirit, the "it" implied by the Greek pneuma or the "she" required by the Hebrew ruah? Is the Spirit a person like the others, or must it be understood conceptually?

Traditions about the Spirit include a variety of responses. At least as early as St. Augustine one may find descriptions of the Spirit in non-personal imagery. The Bishop of Hippo contributed assorted memorable descriptions of the Trinity as symbolized by the triads of memory, intellect and will, or lover, beloved, and love (the act of love). The Spirit corresponds to memory and love. The difficulty with this imagery, which as a Western Church legacy has in many ways been overpowering, is that it obscures the personal character of the Spirit. The integrity of the Father and the Son's divinity had been stormed all through the Gnostic and

Logos controversies, and so was defended. The Spirit appeared in movements like Montanism and Donatism, and so in a sense had to be attacked, or at least subdued. The Spirit was notably absent or subordinate in the writings of the Apologists and Alexandrians, and even in Augustine's work teaching about the Spirit could be seen to give way to more and more discussion of grace as the means by which God influences his creatures, as the communication of his presence.

From the very outset of Christianity, however, there existed an alternative tradition about the Spirit. This other approach is that of the Apostolic Churches and early Jewish Christianity, which at every step of their existence witnessed to the presence of the Spirit in their lives. Such devotion did not end with such groups but continued to flourish in those parts of Christendom where the "Jewish" legacy survived, especially in the Syriac, and probably through them, in the Eastern Churches (Orthodoxy). The desert fathers and hermits comprise such a class almost to themselves, although they are descended from the same tradition of spirituality. One cannot overlook, however, the figures of Irenaeus and Tertullian in the Latin Church (though Irenaeus represents something of a "foreign" element so far West as Lyons); both were experiential Christians who definitely regarded and described the Spirit as personal. In fact, remembering Tertullian's contribution of the very word Trinitas and the enthusiastic support that the lonely Athanasius won from the Egyptian monks for his doctrines, one might venture the theorem that there has been no advance in Trinitarian or Christological formulation except given a prominence of this special Spirituality.

Now, there is a striking coincidence of privative conceptualizations of evil and non-personal ones of the Spirit in Western piety. Similarly there is a respectably consistent correlation of evil envisaged as active and demonic with devotion to the Spirit in the context of enthusiasm and experiential piety. This ought to stir one's curiosity about the environment of enthusiasm. Whether examining the intertestamental apocalypticism, or that of the New Testament, or Christianity of the pre-Recognition persecutions, one immediately observes a regular pattern of men undergoing great suffering, but surviving or enduring it to the end by dint of faith and hope in an impending or ultimate vindication and freedom from their misery. Not only may that phenomenon be observed in the earliest centuries of Church history, but throughout, as in the Desert Christianity, medieval enthusiasm and millennialism, Reformation enthusiasm and Utopianism, in European and American Protestant pietism alike, to say nothing of the latter day Pentecostalism to be found on every continent of this globe. The common bonds of suffering, impoverishment, membership in a despised or oppressed class are manifest in each of the named groups to one degree or another, by lot, or in some instances by choice. Some of the emphases that they share in doctrine include the renewal of the image of God in justified man, and his consequent rebirth and life of sanctification; the extension of the same to property and society; experience of life in the Spirit as dignifying and therapeutic but also demanding withdrawal in some form. Certain of these last emphases ring clearly in the theology of Martin Luther King.

In preparation for the following chapters I would point

out of the frequent occurrence of a Christianity of Spiritual activism in the Third World. Such Christians are the heirs and perpetrators of the historical legacy that has just been described. I do not see how this could possibly be overlooked or left unexplored any longer, not when we live at a time of Third World ascendancy and its collision with vast portions of faltering Western civilization. This ascendancy has not so much to do with hegemony, as the anxiety of Western culture defensively expects, as with a revolution of the values by which the world is ruled, a re-definition of the qualitative priorities by which human dignity is enhanced or vitiated, all according to a synthesis of insights pouring in from non-Western society. The thesis here is that one can draw out a balanced presentation of this revolution as a theology of spirituality. Actually, in this essay spirituality connotes not just Christian religious activity, but also pneumatology, a fusion of piety and theology. It also means historical recollection--what else may one say of a trend which unites, as I hope to show, various spiritual movements across the entire spectrum of Christian history? Hardly all of it can be dealt with here, of course, but what facets I can order will hopefully be convincing. Yet this thesis is happening in the world about me faster than I can observe or digest, which is simply to say that the Lord is *like* Spirit, that his thoughts are not my thoughts, and that his ways are many. The secret things belong to the Lord our God; but the things that are revealed belong to us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the works of his law. For that much we can expect the Spirit's aid.

Notes to Chapter One

¹Sartre, Introduction to the Wretched of the Earth, by Franz Fanon, N.Y., 1966.

²See The Phenomenon of Man, N.Y., 1959.

³Robert Capon, An Offering of Uncles, N.Y., 1967; p. 18.

⁴Paul Tournier, Guilt and Grace, N.Y., 1962; p. 24.

⁵Bruno Bettelheim, The Informed Heart, N.Y., 1960; p. 101.

⁶ibid., p. 76.

⁷Paul Bull, C.R., The Revival of the Religious Life, London, 1914; p. 4.

⁸viz., John McQuarrie, Principles of Christian Theology, N.Y., 1966; p. 210f, 242-43.

⁹See Viktor Frankl, Man's Search for Meaning, Boston, 1962.

¹⁰Bettelheim, op. cit., p. 20, and p. 122f.

CHAPTER II

I. A. Doing the works of the Law in twentieth-century America means trying to reach a fulfillment of the prophetic ideal of doing justice, loving mercy, and walking humbly with God. It is perhaps astonishing to realize how closely aligned are the attitudes toward reaching that vision of earnest reformers (or for that matter revolutionaries) in and out of the churches. This is the legacy of a history of reform and even utopian-minded movements of both "sacred" and "secular" motivations that have so interpenetrated one another as to regard their spheres of activity as virtually the same in many instances. This phenomenon has been observed by keen critics who have drawn contrasts between the religious secularism of Europe and America but come to quite different conclusions about the differences. Herbert Richardson, speaking from the American point of view, attaches great significance to this difference:

Dietrich Bonhoeffer, the patron saint of secular Christianity, observed that European secularization and American secularization reflect opposed tendencies. In European secularization, religion ceases to exist as a separate phenomenon because the state, science, commerce, and other secular institutions are invested with autonomous dignity and power until they finally encompass the full meaning of life. In American secularization, religion ceases to exist as a separate phenomenon because it seeks to embody itself fully in the state, science, business, and other worldly institutions by identifying its concerns wholly with theirs.¹

Richardson is not interested as Bonhoeffer in poking holes in the buoyant, ballooning optimism and naïveté that has often made the

American development seem to become "sheer utopianism and idolatry." Nor is Richardson interested in dismissing American Christianity as one to which "God has granted . . . no Reformation."² In fact Richardson finds that the peculiarly spiritual emphases of American Christianity, originating in large part in the presence of pietistic, Pentecostal and utopian movements which made this country their "adopted homeland," raise "specific theological objections to certain of the positions of the Reformation or Counter-Reformation," as we have discussed above.³ The simple principle guiding American theology, and transforming it from a secularizing to a divinizing enterprise, is precisely the prominence given to the Holy Spirit.

B. In line with Richardson's observations one may point out that at present American thought chooses and elaborates on social categories to express itself. This might be styled the emergence of a metaphysic of society. This-worldly possibilities of transcendence are implied in the quest for peaceful co-existence within and between nations, and in the use of psycho-sociological categories to attempt an integration of man and his environment (ecology as sociology). The same categories largely govern the concept of moral evil as worked out earlier in this paper. Nor can one overlook the quest for transcendence through participation in a non-worldly, Godly quality of holiness seen in all its beauty of truth, innocence and purity as the life principle of the Kingdom of Heaven among us. Certainly the civil rights movement has been conditioned by and has itself even conditioned this ideology. Its philosophers include every man like Kenneth Clarke, Erik Erikson, Kenneth Boulding, Barbara Ward, Oscar Lewis, Paolo Freire

and the members of the New Politics or New Left. Its theologians are the Christian social activists and clergy, while its spiritual directors are the Martin Luther Kings and Thomas Mertons.

C. To recognize King as a theologian-spiritual guide supplies us a pivot on which to turn further discussion. For one of his accomplishments was to apply^{thoroughly} some venerable but neglected principles of Christian theology to problems of our times approaching them on contemporary sociological terms. Human solidarity, for instance, is an irremovable basis for reaching an understanding of King's entire program of social reform. That solidarity is the factor which makes all concerns mutual, and which points to the oneness of destiny. The theme becomes especially strong in King's thought toward the end of his life as he moved deeper into a position of spokesman for the oppressed of every race and nation.

The real reason that we must use our resources to outlaw poverty goes beyond material concerns to the quality of our mind and spirit. Deeply woven into the fabric of our religious tradition is the conviction that men are made in the image of God, and that they are souls of infinite metaphysical value. If we accept this as a profound moral fact, we cannot be content to see men victimized with ill-health, when we have the means to help them. In the final analysis the rich and poor are tied together. They entered the same mysterious gateway of human birth, into the same adventure of mortal life.⁴

King's perception of a metaphysical dimension to reality ties together, as this passage shows, his reliance on the theological understanding of man's nature expounded as solidarism, and on the pre-suppositions about human personality, underlying any differences of race, estate, or other inequality, found in modern psycho-sociological, but also in economic and other social sciences. This shows great human sympathy illumined by a faith conviction, a wedding of the rational and the mystical.

But solidarism is hardly a new idea in theology; rather it is at least as old as St. Athanasius and the writings of the "classical" school of atonement, especially of the Greek fathers. This view, of course, now enjoys renewed currency because of such works as that of Bishop Aulén,⁵ but King seems to be responsible for its most exhaustive use as a principle of modern spirituality. The acceptance through non-violence of redemptive, vicarious suffering harks back directly to that earlier doctrine of atonement by which Christ is seen as the pars pro toto.⁶ Here also we have arrived at the true touchpoint between the historical and theological strands whose integration I am attempting. The intersection is the prophetic category, the theme of the servant-champion whose resistance against evil and whose passion are the means by which redemption is won, whether by the Redeemer himself or by the disciples who continue to bear the sufferings of His Body. The vigor of prophetism is echoed in the words from Deuteronomy quoted earlier, words of grace in which life is found. The same vigor ruled at the spiritual center of life at Qumran, where Deuteronomy was avidly studied, and underlies the words of the Johanne Christ which are our spiritual law:

If you love me you will keep my commandments. I shall ask the Father, and he will give you another Advocate to be with you for ever, that Spirit of truth . . . If anyone loves me he will keep my word . . .⁷

Early Christian asceticism in Egypt and Syria represents another expression of the prophetic word vivified by the Spirit, both in its attitude toward Scripture and in activistic features of ascetical life style. We shall take up that matter later, but for now it serves to demonstrate the fact of the interconnection of pro-

phetism and spirituality (as I have defined it). A prophet is ineffective without the Holy Spirit; he needs not just esprit, not only élan or dynamic, but the gift of the Holy Spirit above all (viz. Eze. 13:10, Isa. 11). One may then expect that the prophetic life style may in its own turn give insights into the character and nature of the Holy Spirit by returning our attention to him.

II. A. One obstacle to easy discussion about the Spirit is the little regard for the Spirit's personal character that distinguishes most of our thinking about him.* The reasons for this are so ingrained that it is hard to overcome them, but I believe there is no choice but to recognize the difficulty and begin to combat it here. In the previous chapter I alluded to the Western tendency to rationalize the Spirit away through highly conceptual imagery, or else to subordinate his identity particularly to Christ. The Dutch theologian Hendrikus Berkhof, after making similar observations in more detail about the work of men such as Augustine, Calvin and Barth, sums up the modern significance of this trend by criticizing it as merely an instrumental view which does not "do full justice to the preaching of the New Testament about the Spirit":

This is the main pneumatological trend in ecclesiastical theology. The Spirit is customarily treated in noetical, applicative, subjective terms. He is that power which directs our attention to Christ and opens our eyes to his work. The main result of his work is the awakening of faith in Christ. His work is merely instrumental . . . So the Spirit is a sec-

* For at least the next section I am adopting the pronoun use of "he" chosen by the Jerusalem Bible translation of John, as it harmonizes with the gender of Parakletos in Greek, although for reasons that will emerge later "she" might seem a better choice. Because it would sound too contrived at this point I will forego its use.

ond reality beside Christ, but entirely subordinate to him, serving in the application of his atoning work, in the realization of justification by faith.⁸

Just how to tipify this problem is elusive since actually much religious talk passes back and forth between hazy uses of the word Spirit that move from clearly personal referents to quite impersonal ones. Such a problem is one which I believe the prophetic tradition can help to clarify.

B. 1. The exegetical problem runs into similar difficulties, and the well-known article on pneuma in Kittel's Theological Word-book of the Bible is an illustration of that. The next few paragraphs will follow its outline. Beginning at the Old Testament, one encounters the understanding of pneuma as the Spirit of God. Together the Old Testament, apocryphal and pseudepigraphal writings witness to the Spirit as a Spirit of Holiness who exists externally to man and comes to him in special situations.⁹ His works are pertinent to the prophetic office in that he knows all man's deeds and so accuses him at the time of judgment, a view which seems to obtain in parts of the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs among other places.¹⁰ Another important Old Testament tradition about the Spirit reiterates the necessity of his presence for righteousness: there were significant ancient rabbinical texts claiming that where the Holy Spirit is, there are righteous men. Similarly the Spirit was considered as a reward for righteousness and an aid thereto, but particularly for self-sacrifice.¹¹ Dt. 21:7-8 illustrates the belief in the Holy Spirit's deeds of "speech" and inspiration.¹²

The most fruitful Old Testament citations, however, are those which meditate on or describe the activity and endowment of the Spirit on the creaturely, temporal realm. Great Old Testament

personified

spoke by the Spirit's inspiration, which is the idea recorded at Ecclus. 48:12, 24. In short, to "get anywhere" in the Old Testament one needed the endowment of the Spirit.

The Old Testament bears witness that Moses was a prophet. David and Salomon must have had the Spirit as authors of Old Testament writings. Only if a priest had the Holy Spirit could he successfully give oracles through the Urim and Thumim. The Patriarchs were naturally bearers of the Spirit, but their wives, too, saw and spoke through the Holy Spirit.¹³

But also, Judges are inspired (Jg 3:10), and endued with discretion by him (Num. 11:17). He aids craftsmen, inspires prophets, grants wisdom to the young Joseph, and so pervades every aspect of the lives of every type of Old Testament worthy.¹⁴

The traditions linking an outpouring of the Spirit to the coming of the Messiah obviously weigh most heavily on the later Christian hermeneutical practices. In the last time, it was expected, the Messiah would possess the Spirit (Isa. 11:2). Outside the Old Testament the non-Christian passages of the Test. XII speak of the "Spirit of Sanctification," of grace given by God himself or by his Messiah.¹⁵ The great events which in Rabbinic traditions were expected to accompany the intervention of the Messiah, or were to be somehow linked to his work, such as Resurrection by the Spirit of God, and removal of Israel's heart of stone, found their inspiration in the appropriate passages of Ezechiel (36:26, 37:27). In the last times also, according to Joel, the Spirit would be given to all the children of Israel that they might become prophets (Joel 2:28).¹⁶

The closing of the Jewish canon cut short much mention of the prophetic Spirit. With the last of the prophets behind, Malachi, Zechariah and Haggai, the Rabbis were sure that the Holy Spirit spoke no more, except in the most isolated instances when

the gift of the Spirit to a rare and saintly Rabbi was attested; but almost simultaneously there blossomed a profound and accumulated Wisdom tradition. Israel's bitter experience of exile and agonied yearning to return to Jerusalem and restore the temple was the seedbed in which still another important tradition, the Priestly, or Holiness one, grew strong, even dominant.

One finds an important exception to silence about the Spirit in the case of the Qumran sectarians, from whose writings it has been determined that they believed that the Holy Spirit continued to work in their midst, especially in prophecy.

Members of the sect of the new covenant in Qumran regarded themselves as possessors of the Holy Spirit. Through the Spirit they had insight into the divine mysteries, were cleansed from sin, and were enabled to lead a new life according to God's will (IQH 4:31; 7:6f; 12:11f, etc.).¹⁷

Recent scholarship has been able to find in Qumran a definite background, and some would even say environment, for many of the themes and figures of the New Testament, on the strength of just such ties as their devotion to the Holy Spirit. A Persian-inspired dualism of conflict between a Power of Good and a Power of Evil, though modified in light of a faith that the Good finally held the balance, survives in the Dead Sea scrolls. The Johannine literature is conspicuous for the use of related dualisms (in terms of truth, light, etc.), but these also show up in Jewish and Christian apocryphal literature (in terms of spirits, angels, or of man as indwelt by the Spirit or the Devil).¹⁸ Just as it is important to see the Priestly-Holiness themes in the light of the Exilic experience of Israel, it is essential, we might add, to remember Qumran in its self-exiling protest against Jerusalemic Judaism and the hardships of its domination by Rome. The significance of the

Good Spirit-Evil Spirit categories sharpens against that background.

The remaining Old Testament record of the Spirit which ought to be noted is that of his cosmic operations. Actually this is where the canon begins--at Genesis and the movement of the ruah of God over the waters of chaos. Although there may be some technical difficulty with the double meaning of this Hebrew word, ruah, of both wind and spirit, I think that by virtue of its link to later hypostases of the Word and of Wisdom, one may assume that at quite an early stage ruah in the Creation account was understood in terms of a higher connotation of spirit, and not just wind or breath. Judith 16:14, and Wis. 1:7 are instances of a recollection of the spirit's role in Creation on the part of some Apocryphal writings. The biblical language about the spirit of man, the willing spirit which upholds him, is the anthropomorphic extension of this record of the Spirit. This has to do with spirit as life-principle, as when Yaw^heh Elohim breathes life into the creature Adam, whom he has formed out of the dust. Spirit in this sense means vitality, but it also carries a message of finitude: e.g., the over-pessimistic musing of Wis. 2:3, "When it is extinguished, the body will turn to ashes, and the spirit* will dissolve like empty air." This is created spirit. The ruah of God, on the other hand, does not appear, even in the Old Testament, to be created in nature, but to proceed directly from God. In fact most of the evidence from the Old Testament and extrabiblical sources alike attribute no little autonomy to the ways of the Spirit. Its degree

*Here a translation of the Greek LXX pneuma, but it clearly refers to the same phenomenon as does ruah.

evokes a judgment of "surprising" from Sjöberg, author of the Old Testament section on pneuma in the TWNT, as he surveys Rabbinic sources. There the Spirit is said variously to speak, cry, admonish, sorrow, weep, rejoice, comfort, and even to speak to God.¹⁹ This is certainly evocative of the language that St. Paul will use in his letter to the Roman Christians.

Sjöberg's summary is fruitful in many ways. It gathers the emphases proper to the Old Testament categories of the spiritual: prophecy, holiness, righteousness, the works of creation and renewal. The same discussion also draws attention to the extremely personal character of the Spirit's operation, whatever conclusion is to be made about whether or not such personification amounts to hypostasis. There is, however, an hiatus between the tone of this portion of the pneuma article, and of that by Eduard Schweizer, which deals with the New Testament material. While the latter covers the whole of the New Testament passages of importance to any discussion of the Spirit, it does so by departing of the personalizing approach which Sjöberg has rightly, I believe, imputed to the Old Testament. Instead, Schweizer agrees in the main with opinions like Barret's (cf. The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition, London, 1947), which clearly denies that any such approach may be said to exist in the Synoptic Gospels. Because Schweizer treats more than just the Synoptic witnesses his own conclusions are more balanced, but it may be shown that in any case he has brought to the analysis the de-personalizing trends of contemporary exegesis and theology regarding the Holy Spirit as cited by Berkhof.

2. On what basis can it be said that this acknowledged

tendency of Judaism to portray the Spirit as personal survives in the New Testament? The question can be answered doubly, I think: on the strength of New Testament material itself, where reference to the Spirit becomes profuse, language about him becomes extremely personifying in its quality, and personal (i.e., of individuals) experiences of the Spirit abound; and on the evidence of developments in the Jewish and Jewish-Christian milieu contemporary with or posterior to the creation of the New Testament canon. These developments range from pious opinions about the feminine character of the Spirit and about angelology, to the rise of asceticism. Evidence from this milieu would seem to work proleptically, as I will try to show. As may be expected, because of the wider reasons before this essay, I would also like to expand on the significance of having a "Jewish" as opposed to a Hellenistic context for the New Testament and the theme of the Holy Spirit.

While looking into the same, it is necessary to recognize how from the very opening of the New Testament canon one is confronted with the Spirit. The Virgin Birth of Christ is one of the three stages at which the Spirit intervenes in his life which also seem to be indispensable facts (according to the Gospels) if we are to know him aright. The Baptism-tentation sequence and the Resurrection-Ascension-Pentecost sequence are the other two. This concern runs through the four Gospels and Acts, in which the mystery of sacred history unfolds, while the recapitulation of that history in the individual and community's life becomes the subject of the rest of the canon.²⁰ One is bound, I should think, to respect the integrity of that pattern, and that is why in discussing the Spirit in the New Testament I would like to proceed more or

less as if exegeting the Virgin Birth in order to demonstrate the issues that have been mentioned.

3. Matthew, but especially Luke and John's concern to give a history (or theological statement) of Jesus' birth has served as much as any other aspect of the Gospels to draw the verdict of Hellenism from their jury of exegetes. The hidden or explicit allegation, especially in Luke and John's case, is that they see Jesus through eyes alien to the mode in which he might have viewed himself, that their position as later evangelists finds them in a major shift away from Jesus' time that entails a less dependable reading back the experience of another generation into their portrayal of Jesus. This means that the unmistakably "pneumatic" Jesus of the Third Gospel, for instance, must be accepted as a creation mostly of the post-Resurrection, "pneumatic" Church. The possibility of a "pneumatic" Jesus has been held in abeyance in the absence of any historical data affording to him such a spirituality.²¹ In any case, Luke and John have traditionally been regarded, at least in German-dominated exegetical studies, as Hellenistic pietists, who therefore obscure a priori the real content of Jesus' piety. This happens almost solely because of their fixation on the miraculous motif as his birth-setting, and on the recurrence of allusions to the Spirit throughout the Gospels. New discoveries in Palestinian archeology, notably the Qumran documents, and the corresponding shift of hermeneutics toward more interest in New Testament eschatology have off-set this remarkable indifference to the Spirit (viz., Bultmann). That change pretty much controls the stances I will take here. The other critical allegation to be answered is that the Holy Spirit of the Gospels, in particular the

Synoptics, is an impersonal entity.

The principal difficulty with the Virgin Birth is that it has countless classical, mythological counterparts, it would seem.

To the belief that Jesus was born of a virgin through the agency of the Holy Spirit parallels have been adduced by learned men. The process seems to have begun on the Christian side by the second-century apologists who used the parallels to show that their doctrine ought not to appear incredible to pagans--a dangerous use of analogy . . . E. Meyer says of the birth narrative: 'This narrative has its analogy and model in the popular belief of the Hellenistic world.' But this is hardly to say more than that Hellenistic world believed in the existence of not a few beings which were both human and divine, and that it had proved convenient and attractive to find a correspondingly mixed mythological origin for them.²²

All considered, the terms of the debate have not progressed too very much. Most theology and hermeneutics, resigned to the elusiveness of the historical Jesus, and molded by certain philosophical-theological commitments, have by now either given up the doctrine or accepted the Incarnation with or without the details of a miraculous birth of Jesus. (It is instructive to know that comparative apologetics still survives, but the appeals are now not to legends of divine-human heroes, which no one believes, but to scientific possibilities like parthenogenesis!) Such comparisons can be rejected almost categorically, and a deft scholar like Barrett¹ is able to eliminate the necessity of any such parallels.

4. The solution that Barrett² advances for this dilemma, and the one accepted by Schweitzer, and used by other scholars, derives from the eschatological themes surrounding the coming of Messiah, but this only says half of what needs to be said about the Spirit in the Gospel infancy narratives. While rather thoroughly demolishing the effort of one German scholar to link the Virgin Birth to the Egyptian tale of Numa and Egeria, Barrett

comments:

The context (referring to Numa) makes quite clear that Plutarch is speaking of real physical intercourse. Nothing else is thinkable in the case of Numa and Egeria, and this instance governs the whole context. This fact must determine the meaning of the word pneuma in this passage. pneuma must represent a personal divine being, a god; not merely rarefied matter (Plutarch was no Stoic) nor even undifferentiated divine essence . . . We perceive at once an important difference between Plutarch and the Gospel infancy narratives.²³

Now does this mean that one is to understand that Luke and Matthew were Stoics, and that their conception of the Spirit was in no way personal? This will have to be answered later on. Elsewhere Barrett sums up the pertinent Old Testament passages which round out the argument against a mythical origin of Luke and Matthew's infancy narratives. The Spirit appears in these accounts

to act creatively upon matter; not merely to produce visible effects in the physical world, such as the casting out of demons or speaking with tongues, but to be itself productive. This essential element of the narratives is closely associated with the notion of divine begetting, which as we have seen, is one that flourishes on pagan rather than Jewish soil.²⁴

That which they reflect most from the Old Testament literature, beginning with the most important passage, is Gen. 1:2, and notions of later Rabbinic Judaism, where, as we have already surveyed, there begin to be speculations about the Spirit's re-creating, re-vivifying power of the days of the Messiah.²⁵ Barrett adeptly moves to the conclusion that

We now have in our hands sufficient data to explain the phenomena which we find in the New Testament . . . We observe that the earliest Christians appear to have seen: that just as the Spirit of God was active at the foundation of the world, so that Spirit was to be expected also at its renewal. The conclusion is easily drawn that the entry of the Redeemer upon the stage of history was the work of the Spirit into the birth narratives . . . Ruah is generally feminine and is God's activity, not a personal demigod . . . The motive which introduced the Spirit into the infancy narratives were rather Messianic and eschatological.²⁶

The apparent contradiction of themes susceptible of Hellenistic and Jewish interpretation juxtaposed in the same narratives can be explained in only one way:

We have just seen that this genuinely biblical concept of the activity of the Spirit in the new creation was kept alive chiefly in Hellenistic rather than in Palestinian Judaism, and it seems therefore probable that the elucidation of the birth of Jesus in terms of the creative work of the Spirit took place on the basis of Hellenistic rather than Palestinian interpretation of the Old Testament.²⁷

Neither can this be a pagan theme because the begetting agent is not male, but female (the Spirit) in character. So this notion of creation becomes one of begetting in the accommodation of the Gospel to Hellenistic from Jewish thinking. The balance to this must be seen in the evangelists' persistent resort to feminine imagery when speaking of the Spirit, and the Baptism narratives are the next most supportive evidence of this. Here also there is an obvious association between the presence of the Spirit and the act of begetting to be seen both in the manuscript traditions which add the rest of Psalm 2:7 to the words of the heavenly voice (cf. Lk. 3:22)--"This day have I begotten you"--and the adoptionist christologies which have relied so heavily on the text. Even that implication, however, can be avoided on the basis of other Rabbinic texts linking dove-Spirit imagery,²⁸ although Barrett spurns evidence adduced from relevant apocryphal New Testament writings,²⁹ though not without observing the following point:

It is very important that the evidence, such as it is, points to the text which we found fundamental in our discussion of the birth narratives, to Gen. 1:2; that is to say, here too we have to deal with the creative activity of the Spirit; a new thing was being wrought in the waters of baptism comparable with the creation of heaven and earth out of primeval chaos. (p. 39)

The "new Creation" (also a Pauline theme, as Schweitzer notes) is

the Messianic age. That conclusion is reached by recognizing the enthronement theme of Psalm 2, the referrent of the words from heaven. More such evidence can be mustered from the Test. XII, notably in the Test. Levi, 18:2-14, a Messianic hymn. The Baptism, in short, proclaims Jesus' anointing as the Messiah. The voice from heaven has precedent in the Rabbinic bath qol³⁰ tradition, and the /q bodily shape attributed to the Spirit (somatikōi in Lk; as a dove in the other accounts) remains the only detail that is not explained with reasonable tidiness; the difficulty seems to be his visibility.

5. I have permitted myself this rather lengthy summary of Barrett's treatment of the infancy narratives both because of his solid standing as a New Testament scholar and his representative point of view. His bias about the nature of the Spirit as impersonal is obvious:

Two points remain to be accounted for: the use, in the Gospels, of pneuma for impersonal, divine force, not a divine being; and the relation, which must be presumed to exist, between the notion of Spirit involved in conception 'by the Holy Spirit' and that contained in the Old Testament.³¹

On this point there is a difference between Barrett and Schweitzer, who does not agree (as I would not) that in the Gospels pneuma is identical to dunamis, or at least not in Luke's Gospel.³² For Barrett the idea of the Virgin Birth is not congenial to Palestinian Jewish thought, so that that motif is more appropriately considered Hellenistic, a milieu which is distinguished by high interest in virginity per se and divine-human births.

Thus we are left with a picture of the Spirit's creative role which in Barrett's case requires such an impersonal concept of Spirit as to import terms like "undifferentiated divine essence," or "impersonal, divine force" into a discussion of biblical mate-

rial in which such notions are entirely lacking. Schweitzer, though not in accord with the equating of power and Spirit, seems to have lost somewhere, partly through his assent to his "creational" understanding of the Spirit's role in the Virgin Birth, the force of the hypostatizing trend of Jewish speculation about the Spirit so clearly brought out by Sjöberg's earlier discussion. It does not seem to me that the force of that trend would be lost on any of the evangelists. It is one thing to assume that their relative silence about the Spirit represents Jesus' doubtless hesitation to speak much of him because of his link to the Messiah--the view of Barrett and Schweitzer, which I feel is highly tenable. It is something else, on the other hand, to extrapolate from the available evidence about the Virgin Birth tradition a Hellenistic philosophy:

In Mark and Matthew then, the Holy Spirit is viewed in the same way as in the Old Testament. He is the power of God which makes possible speech and action of which human resources are not capable. Only in the idea of conception by the Spirit is there a parallel to the later thinking of Hellenistic Judaism. Completely new, however, is the strict subordination of phenomena of the Spirit to the realization that the Messianic end-time has dawned. Thus all the pneumatological statements have a purely Christological reference.³⁵

To settle for that view of the Spirit is to strip him of any function save that of witnessing to Christ, but otherwise having no capacity which may be thought of as personally his.

As for the Lucan and Johannine account of the Spirit, Schweitzer says that they "share with Judaism the view that the Spirit is essentially the Spirit of prophecy," without clarifying who or what that Spirit is, and implies a strange discrepancy between the prophetic and other roles of the Spirit:

This does not prevent (Luke) from directly attributing to the pneuma both the charismata iamatōn on the one side and strongly ethical effects like the common life of the primitive community on the other.³⁶

The "strongly ethical effects like the common life" in fact represent the sanctification of the material, giving it universal and not just individual value, and through which God's presence is manifested (the "spiritual sacrifices" spoken of in Hebrews, I Peter) in the community, as also by other acts of love. Paul, with no implication of discrepancy, seems to have no difficulty in ranking either prophecy, or healing, or a spiritual (pneumatikos vs. sarkikos) ethic for the community's life in the lists of spiritual gifts. The indwelling Spirit "of him who raised Jesus from the dead" in Paul's language (Rom. 8:11), who "intercedes for us with sighs too deep for words," is much closer to (and probably realizes) the hypostasis we saw already under way in Judaism. Now Paul is usually regarded as prior to the evangelists historically, so it should be possible that they too had similarly deep intimations of the Spirit, and likely recognized the same ^{of} Jesus. So how does one say fairly that the Gospels present a personal Spirit? And a non-Hellenistic Virgin Birth?

6. The Gospels themselves are the first to offer a way out of the confusion. For there, not only is the Spirit the Spirit of creation, but of holiness, and this would seem to be the prior concern. Matthew states that the Holy Spirit intervenes in Christ's birth because of a requirement of holiness; not the holiness which comes through grace, but by natural inherence, which in any Jew's mind would be possible only of God:

Now the birth of Jesus Christ took place in this way. When his mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph, before they came together she was found to be with child of the Holy Spirit . . . An angel of the Lord appeared to (Joseph) in a dream saying, 'Joseph, son of David, do not fear to take Mary your wife, for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Spirit; she will bear a son, and you shall call his name Jesus, for he will save

his people from their sins.' All this took place to fulfil what the Lord had spoken by the prophet: 'Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and his name shall be called Emmanuel' (which means God with us).³⁶

This synoptist is at pains to show the meaning of "Emmanuel."

/ as Certainly the Virgin Birth is not anything that could be anticipated, and had to have been understood by the community only by hindsight. Yet the hermeneutical principle at work here in the proof-text from Isa. 7:14 is typically Christian in that, like in the experience of the Emmaus disciples, the meaning of holy doctrines long taken for granted is transformed by the light of Spiritual experience. Israel certainly expected her Lord to be with her, and her election, her monarchy, covenants and prophets, and even the promise of the awaited Messiah were proof that God was with her. Matthew's expression of God-with-us is something like saying, "Well, we expected help, but we never thought that you would come yourself!" Yes, the Messiah has come, duly anointed and attended by great works and prophecy, but he is also indwelt by the full perfect holiness of God. He was in Christ from the moment of birth.

7. The same theme emerges more plainly in Luke's account. Gabriel announces to Mary that

The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you; therefore the child to be born will be called holy, the Son of God.³⁷

Modern editing of the Greek of the latter half of this sentence, however, which I consider the key section of the whole Annunciation pericope, raises exactly the problem about the nature of the Spirit that is under discussion. Unpunctuated, the phrase reads

διο και το γεννόμενον Hagion klethēsetai huios theou

To be noted is the lack of an article before hagion and huios, which gives rise to the ambiguity. Should the phrase be punctuated as in various commentaries, the Aland-Metzger Greek NT, and as allowed in a footnote by Aland in the Synopsis?

dio kai to gennōmenon hagion klēthēsetai, huios theou.

This yields the English translation quoted above from the RSV, "therefore the child to be born will be called holy, the son of God." By this method, "child" is supplied as the subject of the passive and therefore intransitive verb klethēsetai, and hagion becomes a predicate adjective; it could never be attributive, in any case. This seems to have support in v. 32, where the order huios hupsistou klēthēsetai can only be understood by translating with an article, "the son of the Most High, and as subject of the verb, which this cluster precedes. The difficulty here is that huios theou simply is not an extension of hagion, as commentators would point out.³⁸ So an alternative punctuation is necessary, probably by punctuating "after hagion and (supplying) estai,"³⁹ which gives, as in the Jerusalem Bible, "And so the child will be holy and will be called the Son of God." The more literal AV has "that holy thing to be born," which solves the syntactic problem apparently by regarding gennōmenon as an attributive adjective.

What problems arise out of this difference of translation? Barrett and Schweitzer, we have seen, look for a Virgin Birth which does not focus only on the miraculous element; that is finally to be unloyal to the kerygma, which is not merely a miracle story. But the heavy emphasis on eschatological and creational themes results in a depersonalizing of the Spirit, and in characterizing him conceptually in non-biblical terms. Such criticism

overlooks the other equally important element of 1:35b, and accordingly makes Jesus' uniqueness turn on the wrong issue. If one reads "he shall be called holy, the son of God," then the problem will go on, because the thrust of that wording invariably suggests that Luke is trying to say that Jesus' uniqueness has only Messianic content (the creation theme), and one tends to think of him as a divine-human figure who must be acknowledged (klēthēsetai) as holy.

8. On the other hand, if my analysis of the syntax is right, then Luke must be understood to be saying that because Jesus is a holy child, having this dignity through a natural relationship to God the Father that is realized by the personal agency of the Holy Spirit, ^{then} for that reason he must be acknowledged as the son of God. This interpretation requires thinking of Jesus as the one individual whose person brings to others a direct experience of God. Not simply "creativity" but holiness is the proper dignity of the Spirit, a clarification of the content of eschatology that appears unmistakably in the New Testament, particularly in the Epistle to the Hebrews, but to be observed in the shekinah themes of the Old Testament Priestly documents as well as (both traditions share a Sabbath eschatology theme) in the Essene piety and spirituality, in short, in a number of (Palestinian) traditions that conceivably informed Luke. The Gospel of justification by faith preaches that by grace God extends to man that which he himself is by nature. That is the position of the New and Old Israel before her God, and would remain true of the Messiah were he simply created by God as the recipient of a mysteriously special grace.

Jesus, however, by Luke's account, and as I have suggested, in Matthew's, has a natural participation in God's nature: Jesus himself, even in mortal flesh, is the Holy One because of the Spirit's relation to him. The Christian becomes (like Mary) God-bearer because the Holy One, by grace of the operation of the Spirit, has indwelled him, bringing him into relation with the living God ("Christ in me"); Jesus' sonship is unique because of the singular condition of his holy nature. Without it there would not be the experience at the end of all the synoptics of beholding at last Jesus' sacrificial innocence (the Lamb-of-God theme of John) in the cry "Truly this man was the (or a) Son of God" (Matthew and Mark, against which Luke complementarily reads "innocent"). The typical problems centering in the first solution to the ambiguous syntax of 1:35b always have to do with controversies of myth/miracle, demigod/divine being dichotomies, whether in apologist logos theology, or in the non-personal, strictly creational spirituality of much modern exegesis. The typical problems centering in my proposed solution produce ^{the} controversies about nature/grace, indwelling/indwelt, prophet/more-than-prophet dichotomies of often allegedly Nestorian spirituality, as well as to invite an adoptionist resolution of these dichotomies. The former problems are typically Hellenistic; the latter are typically "Jewish." In my opinion the evangelists have laid the foundation of the "Jewish" problems--that is, a christology and trinitarianism which calls for a personal understanding of the Spirit, who indwells and unites.

C. 1. I would like to add here some observations about the Gospel of Luke with regard to some extracanonical, Palestinian features in the background of his portrayal of the Spirit, which

lead moreover to still another insight into the Virgin Birth. This other material suggests that it is not inappropriate to think that certain Jewish groups at the time Luke wrote were speculating over personal hypostases of the Word and Spirit, and in a way immune to dismissal as Hellenism. These sources pave the way for theorizing that there were Judaism-imbued thinkers who independently of Hellenistic models, were finding reason to accept the idea of a divinely begotten Savior. Barrett, and in a sense even Schweitzer and Sjöberg, limit themselves almost entirely to argument from Rabbinical material for explicating the Old Testament background of the Spirit. Yet, as the Qumran discoveries have clarified, there was a wholly different circle of thought to be considered, namely apocalyptic, which had become more and more ascendant from Daniel on down to the time of the evangelists, and the first occurrences of Christian martyrdom (Stephen, etc.). As studies in the field grow clearer, other themes besides martyrdom become recognized as central to these groups, especially angelology, and esoteric writings. These means ultimately that there were very early Christians of impeccable Palestinian origin who were to put some of these writings to their own use, or to compose more of their own. This gave rise to orthodox and heterodox gnosés, though the latter (Gospel of Peter, Gospel of Thomas, etc.) never fail to betray their great debt to Jewish ideas. Some of these groups, who remain rigorous Judaizers to the end, even led the vanguard in the fight against Hellenistic Gnosticism, at least in certain regions.* Daniélou, Barbel, Bouyer, Kretschmer, Schoeps,

*Syria; I will take this up later on.

and Quispel are some of the more prominent names of students of this tradition.⁴⁰ Its importance to us is the kind of setting it gives against which to examine Luke, but also the rest of the New Testament.

The appearance of the Archangel Gabriel to Mary, and earlier still to Zechariah in Luke 1 can by no means be casual, but what significance to attach to him has been hard to determine. So Barrett:

It is noteworthy that the infancy narratives of both Matthew and Luke while assigning a large part to angels, attribute the birth of Jesus not to the Angel of the Lord, but to the Spirit, the least personal of what may be called the Jewish hypostatizations of the divine presence.⁴¹

Daniélou, however, is able to reveal a different emphasis in the Jewish Christians, whom Luke doubtlessly knew, as primitive Trinitarians. Their methodology was to talk about the Divine persons in terms of angelology. This meant a "demotion" of the angels as they were assimilated to the Godhead, a trend clearly visible in the New Testament. The tradition that the Law had been mediated by angels (cf. Heb. 2:2) in the Book of Jubilees becomes a role of Michael alone, the chief, and is finally superseded by Paul's contrasting language in Ga. 3:20f and in Heb. 2:3 when the role is assimilated to Christ, who gives the only life-giving Law. In any case, there was a contemporaneous tradition in which Michael's assimilation to the Son is explicit.⁴² But more important still is what happens to Gabriel.

Assimilation of Michael to the Word is confirmed by, and finds a counterpart in that of Gabriel to the Holy Ghost. The crucial text is the Ascension of Isaiah. 'The Angel of the Holy Spirit' is frequently mentioned here, and he is identical with Gabriel. Is this simply a title given to Gabriel, or is it the Holy Ghost in fact represented in the form of the angel Gabriel? The question is still under discussion.⁴³

Daniélou's question intends to caution the reader that the Christ-
ianizing treatment of Asc. Isa. was in flux in many ways.

In his ascension (another Jewish-Christian fascination reflected in all the synoptics in the Transfiguration, but also in Luke's own Ascension story, and Paul's third-heaven experience) Isaiah

sees someone like the 'Glorious One,' and the saints draw near him and worship; he is told 'Worship him, for he is the Angel of the Holy Spirit, who rests upon thee, and who spake also in the rest of the righteous.' Asc. 9:27-36.⁴⁴

There is parallel material in another passage, 11:32-35, which backs up Daniélou's conclusion as he interprets these scenes that

The Lord is the Word, and the Angel of the Holy Spirit is like him. There can be no doubt that this refers to the Third Person of the Holy Trinity. The first seat is on the right hand of God, the second is on the left hand--a detail borrowed in fact from the Jewish figure of Gabriel . . .⁴⁵

The parallel finds its completion in another apocryphal document:

It will be remembered that in the Asc. of Isa. the Angel of the Holy Spirit sits at the left hand of the Lord. Now II Enoch reads: 'The Lord called me and placed me at his left hand, next to Gabriel, and I adored the Lord.' (xxiv,1). Gabriel then is the Angel sitting on the left. There is thus a complete parallel here, which makes it quite certain that the angel of the Holy Spirit in the Ascension is an adaptation of Gabriel.⁴⁶

It is to be noted how the documents cited belong to the orthodox esoterism. Their primitivity shows up in the somewhat subordinate place they show the Son and the Spirit to have before the Father, "one of the particulars in which the angelomorphic theology of the Jewish Christians was to exert an unfortunate influence on the theology of Origen and the Arians."⁴⁷ (There will be occasion to mention Origen once again.) At the same time it is important to keep in mind the distinction between presenting a Person of the Godhead in angelological imagery, and as the manifestation of God in the

form of an angel (or any other being, as Barret would protest), which yields quite different results.⁴⁸

2. When we look back at the Gospels several elements take on a different cast. That Gabriel should appear at all in Luke's Gospel suggests that Matthew was at a more primitive stage of theological speculation about the Virgin Birth, for his angel is simply "of the Lord," is otherwise anonymous, and has no contact with Mary. Luke seems to be privy to much of the Jewish-Christian esoterism, although his canonical status is an index of his restraint. It is not probable that Luke makes a complete connection between Gabriel's identity and the Spirit. This at least might be the inference made from the fact that Luke permits no lurid representation of a conception by Mary by the power of the Spirit before Gabriel's departure. Nevertheless it is to be noted that elsewhere in the Gospel there is a striking, consistent juxtaposition of language about angels and the Spirit. This seems to be the case at 12:8f, where denial before God's angels is tied to the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. At 12:12 the Spirit has a paracletic function especially for those in trial and tempted to deny the Lord, and this suggests another link, now to the Temptation account. At 4:1, as in the other synoptics, Jesus goes into the wilderness under the Spirit's power. In Matthew and Mark angels minister to him after the ordeal, whereas Luke writes that Jesus left in the power of the Spirit. Perhaps this parallel cannot be pressed. Luke does have one instance of solace by angels, 22:43, but not all the ancient authorities have that verse in their text, and v. 12:12 seems to be in conflict with Luke 20:14, where Jesus promises to aid the distressed himself, although I do not know how that could be except through

the understood agency of the Spirit. Otherwise the same interpretation is just one removed. Whatever conclusions may be made about Luke's use of an angelic figure who ranked highly in the first Trinitarian writings--of Jewish provenance--it is overwhelmingly clear that one can say that Luke regarded the Holy Spirit as personal, and also probably as having form (this may also relate to the dove-like figure at the Baptism). ⁴⁹

This returns the discussion to the role of the Spirit in the miraculous conception. Barrett notes time and again that in the Old Testament and in Rabbinic traditions the Spirit is endowed with feminine qualities. This could not be more accurate. Furthermore, the historical context we have been discussing deepens the implications of that fact. For one invariable link between both the canonical and apocryphal writings, even of the heterodox branch of the latter is a continuous tradition about the Spirit, its gifts of prophecy to the saints (a feature left over from Qumram), and his (her?) feminine character. The Gospel of the Hebrews comes to mind immediately, where the Holy Spirit is called mother, a mode which persisted easily until the fourth century in the writings of St. Macarius of Egypt, a Syrian churchman, and therefore a lineal heir of the ancient Jewish-Christian tradition, whose continuity in Palestine and Mesopotamia has now been established.⁵⁰ This peculiarity has value as evidence, even though it is a posteriori. It is impossible to imagine that the co-existence of Christological speculation, coming to terms with Jesus' divine character, and Trinitarian speculation, coming to terms with the preexistence of the Son and Spirit, should have stayed apart. They did not, but rather came together as the Virgin Birth, parallel maybe, but

clearly not dependent on Hellenistic models, providing soil plenty rich for that concept. Furthermore in this development, at least as seen in Luke 1:35 the Sabbatical holiness motif is preserved along the Messianic-Creative motif as the content of eschatology.

3. There are some other features of the Annunciation which are characteristic at once of Luke and of the thriving Jewish-Christian community in which he moved. Perturbed at the application of Isa. 7:14 to herself, Mary protests

pōs estai touto, epei andra ou ginōskō;

There is currently plenty of evidence from the Jewish Therapeutae and the Qumran Essenes that within the apocalyptic communities (to which the latter correspond) around the time of Jesus there was an exalted regard for virginity. This resounds in Mary's first answer to the angel. The Birth Narrative has its own virgin population: the future men, John and Jesus, Mary, and a kind of exception, the prophetess Anna in the Temple at the Purification, who as a widow has lived in continence for an undetermined but presumably long time in the Temple. Jesus himself comes to institute virginity in the synoptic Gospels as part of the demand for discipleship from those "who are able to receive it." While Luke has no phrase like Matthew's "eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom" he does add to Matthean texts, Q and non-Q material, ascetical demands by Jesus, who promises an eschatological reward to all those who for his sake abandon "house or wife, or brothers or parents or children" (non-Q material to which Luke has added "wife"); and again Luke adds "wife" to a Q parallel at Lk. 14:26 // Mt. 10:38. Luke always goes beyond the other evangelists in his implications about virginal asceticism, as in the resurrection controversy

where 20:35 is susceptible of the interpretation that virginity is preferable to marriage (cf. also 23:28-32), but this is probably not the true hermeneutic. In any case we have another tie between the Third Gospel and Jewish Christianity that increases the probable correctness of what has been said so far about the Holy Spirit. It may be mentioned in passing that Luke has a thorough asceticism of poverty, including a form of the beatitude preferred by the Gospel of Thomas, "blessed are you poor," and this tradition almost proved to be the very death of the Ebionite Christians who practiced it so strictly. One must remember the name of the Qumran covenanters, the congregation of the poor.

D. If, however, one is to talk of Jesus as indwelt by the Spirit, it is necessary to say something of Jesus' role as a prophet. In the past this has led to fruitless debates about the psychology of Jesus (How did he regard himself? What was his Messianic consciousness--if any?). That does not concern us at all directly in this discussion. The issue at hand is to show that the Spirit's necessity in the prophetic role affects Christology. To repeat, by the time of the New Testament the traditional Jewish understanding of the Spirit was as the Spirit of Prophecy. The attempt, however, to relate only the late Rabbinic tradition (viz., Barrett, Schweitzer), which always looks backwards in history for the Spirit, to the New Testament milieu does not take into account seriously enough how with the closing of canon the Spirit was felt to speak no more. Quite the opposite opinion obtained among the apocalyptic pietists. Prophecy was practiced at Qumran. In the New Testament, God, who in days of old spoke through the prophets, speaks anew through his Son, Jesus Christ. The witness to Jesus as Messiah always begins

from an appreciation of his prophetic role, and Jesus' own hermeneutical approach to the Servant, the Son who must suffer, whatever it does or does not imply of Messianic self-awareness, derives from a pre-eminently prophetic image. The Sitz im Leben of a church sporadically undergoing persecution is reflected in the merging of the prophets and martyrs' roles:

O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, killing the prophets and stoning those who are sent to you. (Mt. 23:37, but cf. Lk. 11:47, Heb. 11:32ff, etc.)

That is possibly interconnected with Jesus' knowledge that the Spirit will be given to those who in the time of their need request him (Mt. 10:19f, Mk. 13:11, Lk. 12:12). In the Caesarea Philippi query (as at his appearance in the Galilean synagogues) Jesus shows awareness of his role and image as a prophet, the common popular view of this man of dunamis. Yet Jesus never directly calls himself so, and if his response to the common opinion is any guide, his shortness of patience suggests that prophecy was at best a sub-vocation for Jesus. In Luke, for instance, Jesus' rejoicing in the Spirit (10:21) appears to mean that the Spirit provides him more reliable evidence than his power of miracles does for the people around him of the inbreaking eschatological reality, and his connection with it. It remains for later ages to articulate an understanding of the relation of the Spirit to the man.

But here also the New Testament anticipates and inspires later formulations. Just as John expresses Jesus' unique relation to the Father by reserving use of the word huios for Jesus only (teknon perhaps implying adoption, is used of all other men), Luke seems to intend something similar in his choice of words describing

the Son's relation to the Spirit. Whenever he speaks in the Gospel of someone's ecstatic experience of the Spirit Luke employs the word plēstheis or a related form:

kai pneumatos hagiou plēsthēsetai (Lk. 1:15, of John the Baptist)

kai eplēsthē pneumatos hagiou hē Elisabet (Lk. 1:41)

On the one hand no one other than Jesus outside the Birth Narrative in Luke or in any Gospel has such an experience of the Spirit, so the word is significant for this first reason. On the other hand it seems to imply a slightly different to the Spirit than Jesus' own, for which the word plērēs and related forms are reserved:

Iésous de plērēs pneumatos hagiou . . . (Lk. 4:1, a hapax legomenon). To Schweitzer this distinction implies one of permanency, that somehow the Spirit must be seen as being in Jesus and not as coming over him (i.e., indwelling).⁵¹ Schweitzer is prepared to speak of a "pneumatic Jesus," but only because "As one born of the Spirit, Jesus is from the very first a possessor of the Spirit and not just the Spirit's object, like the pneumatic."⁵² In the same place Schweitzer speculates that the non-confusion of the Pentecost and Jordan stories is a "possible indication that for Luke the endowment of Jesus with the Spirit lay on a different plane than that of the community."

In so far as the Gospel is concerned, the distinction holds true. For some reason, however, Schweitzer has overlooked Luke's extension of the idea underlying plērēs into the life of the Church in Acts:

hepta andres) plēreis pneumatos kai sophias (Acts 6:3; but also 7:55, 11:24, 13:52); alongside momentary, heightened experiences

like this:

kai eplēsthēsan pantes pneumatōs hagiou . . . (Acts 2:4, also 4:8, et passim).

So to imply "endowment of Jesus with the Spirit . . . on a different plane" is to accord generally with the traditional subordination of the Spirit strictly to the Christological reality. Of course it is true that Jesus has a unique relation to the Spirit during his earthly life, if only because it is through Jesus' death and resurrection that the Spirit is sent. In the Gospel Jesus, during his earthly life, commissions his apostles with du-namis and exousia, but never with the Spirit (which reason alone is enough to see that power and Spirit are not identical though related terms for the evangelists). On the contrary, the New Testament repeatedly communicates the pattern of the Spirit's being poured out on Christ by a natural indwelling (the Birth) and Christ's sealing as Messiah (Baptism), and finally the sending of the Spirit from the Father in Christ's name, not simply to bear witness to him, but to enable the disciple through grace to recapitulate and extend Christ's redeeming work in the order of Re-Birth, Sealing, and ultimately Resurrection. Schweitzer neglects the first half of what Berkhof calls Christ's double relation to the Spirit as bearer and sender.⁵³ To do so is to begin to lose grasp of Jesus' perfect human solidarity with the whole race, as the pioneer of the life to be achieved by all of us men.

An indwelling spirituality allows one to believe that God allows men freedom of individuality, yet holding them obedient. In the case of Jesus, then, one must understand his obedience to mean that not he, but the Spirit was the Zealot. In that free

obedience truth and innocence--the beauty of holiness--became part of his very being. By the grace of God the Spirit comes to our hearts too, making our lives holy as we are enabled to more and more obedience. We too have a Virgin Birth in Baptism, becoming both a new creation and a holy people, priests and prophets, just as at the beginning of Acts the Spirit baptizes the infant Church, delivering it to a new life. Our life of holiness, bestowing on our nature the dignity of being esteemed for what it is, our means of salvation, and not over-looked for what shines within, come from the Spirit. Through him we have the foretastes of peace and joy of the Kingdom; he brings Christ and our lives to an interpenetration.

NOW there is an overlap of Jewish and Jewish-Christian traditions in which we see the New Testament somehow caught. It at least appears to be consistently Jewish-Christian by its interest in experiential, personalistic life in the Spirit, by appreciating the Spirit's feminine character (themes of rebirth, tenderness --circumcision--of the heart, ethical-familial love, etc.), and by witnessing to the eschatological implications of such a spirituality. Holiness is realized in the institutions of poverty, virginity and prophecy-ecstasy by the natural indwelling of the Spirit in Jesus, and the graceful indwelling in the rest of mankind. This is eventually normalized by baptism and sealing; holiness exists where Jesus as God, the subject of holiness, indwells by power of the Spirit. Thus not only the Son but the Spirit has a personal role in the Incarnation.

III. When Christology is conceived of as a spiritual problem, relating the Spirit to a Man, it is in a better position to

explain the integrity of both natures. That is exactly what happened in the fourth and fifth-century Christological debates, in which one of the major oppositions arose between the Alexandrian and Antiochene-inspired parties of the Church. I do not think that their differences will be best understood in terms of their philosophical backgrounds, e.g., what difference the Aristotelian-Antiochene arguments make vis-à-vis the Platonic-Alexandrian since they were all Alexandrian and apologetic in the sense that they follow the lead of Clement and Origen in making good theological use of formal philosophical language. There is no difference between them in that respect. What is different is their spiritual background, which difference, as I mentioned earlier, was visible in the third and fourth century trinitarian debates, where no progress was made until the Holy Spirit's personal integrity was comprehended. Again it was an environment of Spirit-centered piety that made all the difference.

A. Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius of Constantinople dominated the formal production of the Antiochene thinkers of the era. The very recollection of their names, of course, recalls vivid and stormy histories of inner-church politics, condemnations of heresy by later councils, and a general distrust of those theologians' thought on Christology since the Chalcedonian settlement. Yet it is clear that without them, ^a certainly Theodore, there would have been no Chalcedonian language of one prosopon who is perfect both in deity and in humanity.⁵⁴ Theodore's correction of the Alexandrian-influenced Christology, which was especially current with the groups descended from Origen's tutelage (even when reacting to it) like the Apollinarians, was to recognize that the per-

son of Christ combined not simply a divine Logos clothed in flesh, animating it as the soul does the body, for

'He took not only a body but a complete man, composed of a body and an immortal soul.' Thus the Lord's created soul had real significance in his Theodore's eyes; it was the principle of life and activity in Him, and equally of the saving acts which secure our redemption.⁵⁵

Theodore's favorite image of this perfect conjunction (sunapheia, not quite hypostasis but a term which tries to keep clear of the implication of two Sons or of adoptionism) was that of indwelling.

His conclusion is that the union is kat' eudokian, i.e., by favour or grace. Yet he clearly envisages it as somehow superior to the moral union which exists between God and an inspired man, for he states that it is permanent and (commenting on 'He became man') emphasizes that 'it is not ably a simple act of providence that He lowered Himself, nor by the bestowal of powerful help, as He has done so often and still does. Rather it was our very nature that He assumed, clothed Himself with and dwelt in. . . . With it He united Himself.'⁵⁶

He desired to "display a distinction of natures" but also "a unity of Person." The insistence on a union of God and Man (not flesh) of the Antiochenes deserves credit "for bringing back the historical Jesus."⁵⁷ Where the Antiochenes are concerned, and the tradition they represent, it might be asked whether he was ever missing.

The Antiochene formulations, either of Theodore or Nestorius, failed to win out for different reasons, and the controversies in which Nestorius became embroiled incurred a suspicion which even now is hard to remove. Even so sympathetic an interpreter as Kelly singles their more peculiar emphases as weaknesses:

Secondly, for all his insistence on the unity of the natures, his conception of it as a 'conjunction' (sunapheia) rather than a 'union' (henosis) was ultimately unsatisfactory. It is not really surprising to discover that he sometimes thought of the Holy Spirit as the medium of this conjunction, thereby veering perilously close to adoptionism.⁵⁸

/h

Shortly afterwards, Kelly relates to this the criticism that Theodore's "Common Person" was not worked out in all its implications so that it seemed to suggest that he was not the "Person of the Word," but rather the "product of the conjunction of the man with the Word."⁵⁹ What strikes me is how Kelly does not recognize that at this point Theodore is turning to spirituality to do what he has not elaborated theologically. After reviewing the New Testament material it would be a glaring omission to fail to account for the Spirit's place in Christology. Kelly is demanding a Word-governed explanation just when Theodore is most likely to give a Spirit-governed one. Nestorius later use of the idea of the communicatio idiomatum moves in the direction indicated by Kelly, though Nestorius obviously never really articulated an orthodoxy-placating solution. One might favor Theodore with the criticism that ~~by~~ appealing to the Spirit's place in the conjunction of natures in one Person is by implication to witness more fully to the complete divinity and unity of Jesus Christ, by regarding him also from the standpoint of Trinitarianism. That is the implication of naming the Spirit as "the medium of this conjunction," much more than a flirtation with adoptionism, which the Antiochenes repudiate in any case. This also goes back to the original observation that christology conceived of as a spiritual problem is in a better position to explain the integrity of both the human and divine nature of Christ. Furthermore it might be asked just how successful Chalcedon (preferred by Kelly) was in its own formulations, the questions around which were opened up again at the second council at Constantinople a century later,⁶⁰ so that the former too might be thought to have its shortcomings

despite its orthodox currency (above all in the West).

B. The Christianity practiced in Theodore's Syria appears more and more to have arrived there in orthodox and heterodox expressions of the Jewish Christianity of the Jerusalem Church, which not only persisted locally in Palestine after 70 A.D., but also extended itself into Syria and places farther east. Its activity was evident at ~~at~~^{least} until the fourth century, for which there is assorted proof. Definite connections may be traced through the survival of heterodox New Testament apocryphal literature which was current among respective groups of Jewish Christians in Syria, as well as through the witness of different sources to certain ascetical and doctrinal attitudes of Syrian groups which could be explained only by reference to a parent, Jewish-Christian origin. So heavily has the evidence accumulated that G. Quispel, a Dutch scholar, has been moved to the flat statement that

Jewish Christianity in Palestine remained alive and active after the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 and was instrumental in bringing Christianity to Mesopotamia and further East, thus laying the foundations of Semitic, Aramaic-speaking Syrian Christianity. . . . There is no doubt that Palestine and Mesopotamia are conceived of in our day as a special unit, independent of and of equal importance with Latin and Greek Christianity. Rome, Ephesus and Edessa are held to be the three main centers of the early church.⁶¹

It is necessary therefore to take a brief look at the origins and content of Palestinian Christianity.

1. The Ebionite Christians, heterodox as they were, are the easiest to follow in the movement eastward from Palestine. Hans-Joachim Schoeps has written a definitive work in this field.⁶² While the Ebionites espoused doctrinal views in Christology which could never satisfy orthodox canons, what probably set their sect apart more than anything else was their rigorous piety, which was

a manifestation of fundamentalism. The very name of the sect is an insight into their character:

The names under which these Jewish Christians appear in the lists of sects provided by the Church Fathers were originally honourable names in the New Testament but their meanings had since deteriorated: Ebionim, or 'Ebionites' is a rehebraized ancient title of honor which the remnant of the primitive Church adopted, probably after the flight from Jerusalem, on the basis of Jesus' beatitudes concerning the 'poor' (Mt. 5:3, 11:5; Lk. 4:18, 6:20) . . . Later the hatred and satire of opponents reduced 'Ebionite' to a nickname and term of abuse (the 'poor in spirit,' the 'poor in faith in Christ') so that the Jewish Christians themselves avoided it. They continued, however, to appeal to their voluntary disposition of possessions (following Acts 4:34f) and associated their poverty with the ideal of holiness; indeed, Paul had already spoken of the 'poor' among the saints at Jerusalem' (Rom. 15:26).⁶³

Poverty as an obligation was inherited from the primitive Church, and tended toward egkrateia, or ~~en~~ch¹⁵ratism, in order to radicalize the Mosaic law to show its end as revealing God's pure will.⁶⁴ It is probably not accurate to find inspiration for his practice in Paul, as Schoeps suggests, since if anything his speculations about the law provoked much of the Ebionite rebellion against the Pauline relaxation of Judaizing rigorism (viz, Galatians). Ebionitism is visible, nonetheless in the edict handed down by the Apostolic council of Jerusalem (Acts 15:29), and earlier (Acts 4:34f):

Such asceticism having to do with possessions was never sanctioned in official Judaism. It is only conceivable on the basis of the 'better righteousness' of the Jewish Christian messianic community which understood the symbolic content of its name to represent a genuine, viable obligation and realized it in the voluntary renunciation of possessions.⁶⁵

This brings out the highly ethical motivations of the Ebionites. They made an inner connection between their poverty and holiness (reflected in the "moralistic-legalistic embellishments of the pericope of the rich young ruler in the Ebionite 'Acts'"): ⁶⁶

Apparently the social conditions of the later Ebionites were extremely impoverished and wretched--an inevitable result

of the decision of their forefathers in Jerusalem. Nevertheless, the Clementines allow us to see that for the Ebionites it was not so much the possession of goods^{which was sinful} *Vitself* but rather the greed (pleonexia) for ever new possessions and for becoming rich. They maintained, however, that the Kingdom of Heaven had been promised to the poor.⁶⁷

(This corroborates the earlier observation that Spirit-oriented asceticism has an environment of certain social conditions.)

The writings referred to above, the Clementine Homilies, are a heterodox apocryphal corpus, which along with the apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, the Kerygmata Petrou, and a few other writings comprised the Ebionite canon. As mentioned before, their hermeneutical principle was fundamentalist, pro-Jacobean and pro-Petrine rather than Pauline. In these writings the ethical features that have been cited are spelled out, and on the basis of a prophetic spirituality. This means both that the gift of the Holy Spirit and individual prophetism are important to them, and the category of moral dualism.

(It) clearly is absurd to deny all links between the Clementines and historical Judaism, of which Jewish Christianity is a part. It is stated in these writings that God has a form. This is clearly an expression of the concrete Jewish concept of God as opposed to the abstract concept of so many Greeks. The same belief is found in esoteric Judaism. According to the Clementines, the Messiah and the devil are 'the right' and 'the left hand' of God. Such a conception is inconceivable in a gentile Christian congregation, where evil was considered as a privatio boni. On the contrary, it is consistent monotheism on the lines of the Old Testament and has its counterparts in the Dead Sea Scrolls.⁶⁸

The Clementines held, as also Acts 3:22, that Jesus was the true prophet promised by Moses, and that James was the primate of the Apostles. This probably reflects a caliphate-like grouping of relatives of Jesus in the early Church. The organization of Ebionite community life only re-emphasizes its connection with the primitive church. Aspirants to its teaching order were to be 'good,

pious, circumcised and faithful, taught and tested for six years; there was baptism and initiation into the community by a monarchical bishop (and this by the end of the second century A.D.).⁶⁹ It was taught that the doing of good works "is the proper demonstration of piety," along with other moral exhortations.

The Ebionites were to disappear in the fifth century in eastern Syria, but not without embodying themselves in the forces of defeat or creation of two movements that were virtual impasses in later Christian history; they had to be faced. In each case the Ebionite contact represents a far-reaching irony:

It turns out that it was the posterity of the primitive Church of Jerusalem, the descendants of the Judaists of Jerusalem, who stood on the breach to defend the truth of Christianity for the common cause when, in the middle of the second century, the young Christian Church was confronted by a sudden deluge of Gnostic ideas. . . . It was apparently the Jewish Christians who held the intellectual battle in the front lines, and held off the onslaught of the enemy. The clever Church Fathers, however, wrote their learned works only much later, at a time when the whole struggle had subsided or was all over. It is important to make clear that according to all indications the fight against the Simonians, the Marcionites, and so forth, at least on Syrian soil, was led not by orthodoxy but by Ebionitism.⁷¹

May one not speculate that such resistance to a demiurgic logos or spirit is possible only where there is a solid grasp of the active, personal character of the Holy Spirit, and a lively prophetic ethic?

The other most significant contribution of Ebionite Christianity seems to have been the inspiration of the religion of Islam, as well as to have fed other syncretistic and unsuccessful religions. The links are unclear and often hard to make, but they include those relating the Ebionites to pagan baptizing sects like the Elkesaites and Mandeans; the true Prophet of Islam; some dietary laws, and radically monotheistic doctrines of God's unity.

The advent of Monophysitism into Arabia meant that the

Arabian Christianity which Mohammed found at the beginning of his public activity was not the state religion of Byzantium but a schismatic Christianity characterized by Ebionite and Monophysite views. From this religion many beliefs flowed in an unbroken stream of tradition into the proclamation of Mohammed.⁷²

The full significance does not begin to appear until one remembers the worldwide status of the faith of Islam:

To be sure, a full demonstration of the relationship between Mohammed and the Ebionites is not possible, but the line of tradition has been established. And thus we have a paradox of world-historical proportions, viz., the fact that Jewish Christianity indeed disappeared within the Christian Church, but was preserved in Islam and thereby extending some of its basic ideas to our own day. According to Islamic doctrine, the Ebionite combination of Jesus and Moses found its fulfillment in Mohammed; the two elements, through the agency of Jewish Christianity, were, in Hegelian terms, 'taken up' in Islam.⁷³

There would also seem to be some links between Ebionitism and Manichaeism.⁷⁴ The survival today of originally Christian expressions in major contemporary religions that remain outside of Christianity confronts the latter with the historico-organic reality of religions whose territory usually coincides with the geographic divisions of prosperous, Western Christendom and the often impoverished, non-Western Third World.

2. Christianity in Syria, however, does not consist only in historical heterodoxy, but in mainstream traditions also. There are extremely early reports of Christianity in Syria, and the New Testament itself witnesses to how Jesus' fame "spread throughout all Syria" (Mt. 4:24) as his ministry grew. The wise men from the unnamed east could have come from the Syrian part of the Persian Empire. There are other, peculiarly Jewish pieces of evidence supporting the transmission of Christianity by a disciple named Addai. Quispel suggests that the millions of Jews living there since the

Babylonian exile were proselytized by Pharisees and Christians. Where there were Jewish academies, Christianity penetrated least. Where not, the evangelizing went well, and was done by Jews different than Paul in that they speculated very little against law.⁷⁵ There is even in this instance a continuity of name traditions. The name of "Christian," given at Antioch, was not the Semitic name for Syrian church members, but rather "Nazorees," also attested by Acts (Acts 24:5), which immediately summons associations with encratic groups (Nazirites, Rechabites). The bearers of that name in Acts "who were formerly priests" might reasonably be thought to be the converts from Essenism. The same name still applied to the Christians in Berea (Aleppo) when St. Jerome came across them in the fourth century.⁷⁶

The most significant ties for my purpose here show up in the practices of piety and the devotion to the Holy Spirit which were so characteristically Jewish. Quispel himself strongly urges the validity of the tradition on the Holy Spirit as "Mother" as a link. This feature appears in almost every Jewish-related tradition in and out of orthodoxy. The fourth century writer Aphraates wrote that "As long as a man does not take a wife, he loves and honours God, his Father, and the Holy Ghost, his mother, and he has no other love."⁷⁷ Quispel also relates Macarius of Egypt to this tradition, as has already been noted in this paper. Now Macarius identity is disputed, as is the authorship by a Macarius of the famous Great Letter, which has obvious if controvertible connections with with Gregory Nyssa's De Instituto Christiano.⁷⁸ What matters here is that the content of that writing witnesses over and over again to the power of the Holy Spirit in Christian

experience. Macarius' own imagery in the homilies attributed to him is maternal, and tenderly feminine. The other aspect of his background, namely his connections with the Messalian heresy, in its own way substantiates placing Macarius and Syrian Christianity in the Palestinian Jewish tradition. This was a pneumatic-oriented heresy, whose downfall was its excessive asceticism. It might be thought to resemble Montanism in this respect. It went beyond Montanism, however, in requiring an absolute poverty of the Christian disciple, and even prohibited him from giving alms since he was to be so poor himself as to have none to give! Lietzmann is derisive of this tendency in Semitic Christianity, but I think Quispel summarizes the significance of the Messalian encratism nicely: "Here again we see that Jewish Christian exegesis persisted in Syria; the impressive Syrian and Messalian stress on poverty as a special virtue is a legacy of Ebionite Palestine."⁷⁹ Even with the forcing of Messalianism out of the Church, rigorous asceticism flourished in Syria and Egypt, and would have been all too familiar to Christians of Theodore's time. Invariably its roots were nourished in a strong devotion to the Holy Spirit and an emulation of the holy patriarchs and prophets of old. A Spirit-governed, prophetic-modeled Christology in this part of the world would have been anything but extraordinary.

The intimation here, of course, is that the tradition in which I am locating the Antiochenes goes back to the sectarian Jewish milieu that was sketched earlier. Philosophical adepts like Ephrem, Diodore, Theodore and Nestorius were in a sense an elite in a setting where the real heroes moved in and out of pietistic movements which tended to scandalize the rest of the

churches (as well as modern tastes) more than the aforementioned theologians' works. There was a wide area which took in the Natron Valley and other parts of Egypt, as well as northern Syria in which asceticism of often extreme forms was flourishing. The ascetical movement held a fascination for the Church of those centuries (fourth and fifth) which is probably impossible to appreciate fully from a modern perspective. Yet it must be recognized that within itself this movement and the pious attitudes which sustained and were sustained by it, had a certain kind of "soul" which was "dug" by the avant-garde, the "hippies" of its day, men like Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, St. Jerome, and other worthies from outside that region who ahead of many of their contemporaries foresaw in the Semitic east and adapted from it elements of church life and devotion which were eventually to spread across the whole of Christian tradition. The aspect of the movement which interests us here is the same feature of spirituality, its Semitic origins in the New Testament age and area. Theodore's service to us was to show the relevance of that tradition to other areas of theology, while the practical relevance was elucidated through the works of monastic writers or their admirers.

C. Even still we have not looked at that one movement of Christian asceticism, monasticism, which did most to stabilize and combine the series of themes that have been discussed so far, namely the spiritual life inspired by a Spirit-governed Christology and a life patterned on that of biblical holy men. As may be expected, just as so far I have pointed to a reversal within scholarship of opinions about the origins of the trinitarian doctrine of the Spirit, or about the Palestinian Jewish character of the New

Testament canon, so the assessment of the origins of Christian asceticism is due for a change. This includes not just asceticism as we have so far examined it (of food and poverty), but also the practice of celibacy. The conjoined practices are usually accounted for by reference to Hellenistic practices--stoicism, gnosticism,* etc.--when in fact, as this partial survey should have suggested by now, their origins are not fully understood apart from reference to Jewish Christianity and sectarian Judaism. The asceticism of Jesus and of John the Baptist, as well as of St. Paul, have always been familiar if a little awkward to modern exegetical schemes. On the whole, however, the New Testament asceticism has been dealt with gingerly because of the uneasiness of most classical exegesis with the eschatological themes, although there is reason to believe that that tendency is being reversed. Again, this tradition is explained as Jewish Hellenism, and the ascetical phenomenon is glossed over in church histories until its "emergence" in fourth century Egyptian monasticism.

1. The old point of view, held not only by the liberal historians like Harnack and Lietzmann, but also "officially" within the Catholic Church in many respects, regarded monasticism, or the communal life of ascetics, as a late outgrowth of an exceptional life lived by the Lord and his disciples in the New Testament. The

*Even here, however, another dispute arises, because the Gnosticism that has Christian contacts, if the archeological discoveries of Nag Hammadi mean anything, appears to have spun off from a Jewish Christian parent, rather than to represent a Hellenistic syncretization of Christianity.

only real difference of point of view is that the Catholic Church has always regarded the monastic-ascetic condition as enjoined by Christ, while for the liberals that was a life style uniquely attached to the New Testament personages. Its importance was at best subsidiary; so Lietzmann:

(On the call to discipleship) Those who were ready to serve God unconditionally, would repudiate all the joys of the earth untouched, and render obedience unto death, even on the cross. This attitude bore but an outward resemblance to asceticism, and was in fact only an unavoidable subsidiary phenomenon in a life entirely devoted to the goal set by God.⁸⁰

St. Paul, expectably, suffers a good deal of opprobrium for the extreme views on continence he seems to espouse in the seventh chapter of I Corinthians. Most of Lietzmann's quarrel with Paul and this strain of "nature-religion," is in fact based on that chapter. Partisan claims quickly grew around such practices, although the Church in her mainstream was able to restrain the excesses. Furthermore much of the liberal suspicion of asceticism has found its ground in exactly many of the defensive arguments advanced by the Catholic tradition, such as to esteem ascetics as the only true philosophers: so Clement, John Chrysostom, Augustine, and doctors at many stages of church history. Lietzmann finds the Montanist movement "very revealing" because of its moral dualism (vs. Gnostic ontological dualism) in combination with an ascetical-pneumatic life.

As for the communal expression of this movement, monasticism, the principal difficulty would be that "There were hardly any examples of this sort of thing either before the advent of Christianity or afterwards outside its borders."⁸¹ Obviously the timing of Lietzmann and Harnack's work left them in no position to adapt the insights with which recent Palestinian archaeology is so wealthy. Lietzmann's conclusions on the matter, coming so close as he often

does to what are more current opinions, bespeak the turning point in the whole discussion of the place of Christian asceticism:

Josephus, describing Bannus, sketched a genuine forerunner of the anchorites. A similar case is that of John the Baptist, who is to be reckoned among this class of Jewish anchorites, a genus which, unfortunately, no other records have survived. The notices regarding the Jewish Essenes are so lacking in perspicuity that it is quite uncertain whether their type of life -in-common also necessarily and regularly led to their living together in cloisters; moreover, there are no records at all to the effect that they cut themselves off from the rest of the world. If such records had survived, the settlements near Engeddi, on the west shore of the Dead Sea, of whose existence excellent testimony has come down, would have to be regarded as partaking of that character.⁸²

Finally, not to overlook the sometimes grudging, sometimes admiring regard of the liberals for the monastic phenomenon, it is only fair to point out that they saw much expedient value in the institution (in its Western expression). The same expedience inspired an enthusiastic but demythologizing (not to say romantic) monograph of Harnack entitled Monasticism, in which he raises an evangelical plea for the restoration of the monastic "armies of God" to a Church in need of their vigor.

2. The search for the origins of this form of Christian asceticism carries one to still another encounter of the Holy Spirit. Of all the issues behind monasticism that Lietzmann examines he overlooks the simple but essential matter of its historical timing. By no coincidence at all, the Egyptian anchorites became prominent in the same period in which the Church passed from persecution to Recognition. W. H. C. Frend has charted the development in his absorbing study, Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Christian Church,⁸³ whose starting point is a portrayal of the (second century) Asia Minor Christians under Irenaeus at Lyons, and their amazing persistence through and survival of the murderous persecu-

tions to which they were subjected. The question which Frend pursues is to explain the utter stability of the Lyons Christians' behavior under persecution, and the answer seems to locate them right in the cluster of traditions that have been examined in this essay. The Asian origin of the Lyons group meant that they were directly descended from those parts of the Church in or contiguous to Palestine and which had faced persecution and martyrdom from the outset. Their reliance on the Holy Spirit could be matched only by those parts of the Church we have had occasion to look into and by the Montanists of North Africa. They were also conspicuous for their affinity to Jewish and Jewish Christian life expressions: observance of the Jerusalem edict (Acts 15:20, 29); non-hostile relations with the Jews of Lyons; their description of the Church as "the true synagogue"; and their emulation of the Jewish martyrs heroes recounted in the II and IV Books of Maccabees.⁸⁴ Significantly, "The evidence of the Lyons letter (Deeds of the Martyrs, destined for the home churches in Asia) does not stand alone. It is part of a saga extending over four centuries of Christian history." The "fourth" century would be the pre-Christian activity of the Maccabees.

The Maccabees were engaged in a struggle for their homeland, and pitted themselves against demands of idolatry and threats of extinction. So great was their witness to Torah, however, and so long-standing the integrity of witness within their faith, as real as the presence of God with them, that they were able to defeat the intentions of their persecutors. Even at so early a time one has records of clear articulations of a non-violent resistance to unjust oppression, for the range of militancy was great. Yet

the struggle was always preeminently religious, inspired by the examples of the ancestral prophets:

For both the pious Jew and his Christian descendant the emphasis lay on suffering rather than on armed opposition. Only so long as the religious issue was in the balance did the Hasidim lend militant support to the Maccabees.⁸⁵

Frend is able to identify a continuity of both revolutionary and pacifist forms of witness throughout Hasmonean domination into the Roman era when Christianity became a missionary religion. This in its turn was based on a continuity of religious conviction that took more and more definitive shape from the time of the first Maccabean revolt:

Three main developments which arose from the (first) revolt were later to influence the Christian attitudes towards the Roman Empire. First, was the idea of martyrdom, namely personal witness to the truth of the Law against the forces of heathenism, involving the suffering and even death of the witness. Secondly, derived from this, was the hope of a personal resurrection (cf. Dan. 12:2) and vengeance on apostate and persecuting powers, and thirdly, the transfer of the secular struggle to a cosmic level, with the opposition viewed less as of human oppressors than as representatives of demonic powers. All the tendencies toward righteous suffering, ultimate salvation and judgment on the enemies of Israel became accentuated and personalized as the struggle proceeded.⁸⁶

Thus Josephus, removed from the apocalyptic inner-circle of Palestinian Jewry, sympathized no less from his position in diaspora, and also insisted on a passive resistance which, if sustained righteously, had a reward. In the same spirit Jews everywhere never ceased to plead to God their poverty and dependance on his justification of their cause. Zealots, of course, more actively took things into their own hands, but always by appealing to the issues of justice (problems with money-lenders and tax-collectors) with the express purpose of "stirring up insurrection against the wealthy."⁸⁷ The Qumran covenanters incorporated the same theme through actual manifestations of asceticism, withdrawal, and adopting the name of

"the Congregation of the Poor," as has already been mentioned.

It is not inappropriate to cast light on this by striking some parallels between the make-up of the contemporary black community in America and the first Jewish and Christian martyrs. One cannot help but notice the similar span of militancy among blacks which may be plotted against a geographical or social distribution of the members of that group. The Negro intellectual might be compared with Josephus in terms of his engagement in the black struggle through a kind of dispersion in the white empire, looking on in intense sympathy at his brethren the zealots in the urban centers as they struggle for autonomy. A cohesion of suffering and struggle keeps them in bond, however diverse their inner differences, and the constant appeal to justice as well as a disciplined non-violent struggle alongside violent militancy are continuous within their community. There is much more parallelism or instruction in the two instances than can be observed at this point. It is important now only to stress what in fact is provocatively understated (but not unwitting) in Frend's own discussion about the motives of the martyr tradition which eventually becomes a monastic one. Frend summarizes the developments in Judaism and Christianity as follows:

Our study of martyrdom in Judaism has brought us to significant results. No other people in the Ancient World has left so full a record of so long a history, let alone of their religious and political thoughts as the Jews, and none show such consistency in purpose. Deutero-Isaiah and the prophetic tradition which both precedes and follows it represent the Jews as the martyr people, suffering not merely for their own sins but bearing mankind's as well. The crisis of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes had put this to the test, and the result had been an even more explicit sense of mission. From that moment began to flow the currents of thought which were to influence deeply the ideas of martyrdom in the early Church. Without Maccabees and without Daniel a Christian theology of

martyrdom would scarcely have been thinkable. Without the apocalyptic of the Palestinian Essenes, it could hardly have sustained the necessary fanaticism to overcome the universal hostility of the Roman Empire. Without the dispersion, and in particular the Alexandrian interpretation and allegorization of this apocalyptic, the ultimate reconciliation of the Church and Empire would have been impossible.⁸⁸

Such reconciliation was also impossible without the transition provided
 ➤ by the New Testament. One way in which Jesus fulfills the Law and the Prophets is personally to embody once and for all a witness to their mission in his life-long Passion and his glorification. His disciples are warned that as he was persecuted so shall they also be attacked and made to suffer for him. Paul speaks (or a deutero-Pauline speaker, whichever) of filling out in the disciple's person what is lacking in the sufferings of the body of Christ. In the book of Acts Stephen prophesies and dies a witness for having preached Jesus' pre-eminence as a prophet. Hebrews outlines the Christian pilgrimage from suffering outside the City with Christ to exaltation with him. Revelation drives the same themes home through electric but also blissful apocalyptic imagery. In short, the determining figure is that of the prophet, who as a representative or delegate of the whole people and creation of God (pars pro toto), in the fortitude of the Holy Spirit, confronts and defeats the powers of evil. In the course of history, "This martyr idea which profoundly influenced the first three centuries of Christian history, was given its final meaning in the tense and exalted Apocalyptic of the Asian churches."⁸⁹

4. Beside a climate of ideas--the right psychological disposition to asceticism--monasticism needed an actual physical setting. The Syrian forms of asceticism (like the Montanist) seemed to presuppose that such a life style was necessary of everyone,

whether in the strict Ebionite poverty, or in the well documented cases of required celibacy or commitment to marriage at the time of baptism that several Syrian congregations demanded. The phenomenon of withdrawal (anachoresis) as practiced by the anchorites like St. Anthony in the Egyptian deserts marked a change in those demands--while a rigorous life was still required of all, the ascetical life was taken up by the true spiritual athletes. The locale in the Natron Valley was an ideal setting for withdrawal, but how did the monks come to settle there? The answer, which is still not clear, surely depends on a more complete knowledge in any case of Syrian Christianity. The remarkably frequent features of indisputably Syrian origin (the titles Abba and Amma for spiritual directors; the arrangement of putting neophytes under the direction of "an older, trusted exponent") wins from even Lietzmann the concession that

even in Egypt itself it was possible to find elements originating elsewhere. . . . In other words, it derives from an alien and 'prehistoric' tradition of monasticism.⁹⁰

Once established in the desert the anchorite movement would evolve steadily toward the cenobitic patterns spoused by Pachomius and Basil.

Even before that time the desert dwellers were to find themselves something of a clear-cut community. There was a community of interest. A full forty years before the Great Persecution, from approximately 260-303 A.D., the move to the desert had begun, for men were able to sense from that relatively peaceful period ~~that~~ / *t* Christian discipleship grew lax when prosperity and security seemed to increase. A hermit presence in the desert before Recognition was like the arrival of advance troops to the enemy's new battle-

front before even the main battle has been fought. Equally compelling, the decline of local cults, the rash of social ills in Egypt and Syria helped dispose large numbers of non-Christians to the forceful, traditional social action "inherited from Judaism and displayed on numberless occasions throughout the first three centuries" by the Church. The traditional popular priest-leader of the countryside was losing appeal before the Christian presbyter.⁹¹ Late in the third century Egyptian monks were leading the opposition to the Roman Empire. Monasticism was the form of Christianity that appealed first to the fellahin,⁹² the rural poor who according to Lietzmann came to fill the desert settlements. Hence, "the way was being prepared for the monk to take up the mantle of the martyr."⁹² Motives were mixed: the Life of Anthony reveals that anachoresis described both flight from tax-collectors and flight to the spiritual life of the monk.

Two other yearnings were satisfied by the monastic movement. Protest against social oppression and unrelenting war against the gods who had failed were both causes espoused by the monks. Demons were fought by absolute poverty as well as absolute continence. The Coptic monastery became a refuge against the tax-collector and often a vast economic unit of its own.⁹³

Such militancy and capacity for social involvement on the part of monks who (allegedly) cared little for the business of the world was equally prominent in Syria, and the city of Antioch in the time of John Chrysostom (much later--ca. 387) owed its preservation from a wrathful emperor to the intervention of a colony of monks. They intervened in the heat of an inquiry by the government into a rebellion against the tax burden.

Just what did the man or woman find (for both were received in this radically egalitarian state--it was born among lay people)

who entered the desert school? The invaluable Life of Anthony composed by Athanasius depicts a man who lived in the Bible, outside the institutions of world and church without becoming anti-ecclesiastical. Like the later Antiochene theologians, he was anti-allegorical, and "quite apocalyptic after a Jewish fashion."⁹⁴ He was devoted to the Holy Spirit, who strengthened him in the fight against demons. By popular expectation, the model ascetic (Athanasius' Antony) combined such factors as these:

That his increasingly severe acts of self-denial provoked the demons; and that, by going into the waste places and the deserts, he invaded their special preserves, and challenged them to battle to the death. He wrestled not only with those temptations which were due to the passions of the flesh, but, more particularly, with a thousand forms of physical torments; and it was his victories over those assailants and these difficulties that made him the "perfect" ascetic. As such, God graciously vouchsafed to him visions, foreknowledge, and the gift of miraculous healing; even wild beasts obeyed his commands and served him, just as they had once served Adam in the garden of Eden. As an ascetic, he regained the lost image of God.⁹⁵

Note the prominence of Spirit-given charismata. Lietzmann is appalled by the intellectually sophisticated Athanasius' thorough approval of Antony's spirituality by his assent to notions of combat against devils, a "combined crass belief in demons with high aims of a philosophical and Christian kind."

Lietzmann similarly grossly underestimates this spirituality as a

soteriology in which redemption is attained by a voluntary act of one's own, in which redemption is attained as an example and the Bible only as a text-book, and in which church and sacrament were regarded merely as subsidiary aids.⁹⁶

Enough has been said about the background of asceticism without going into rebuttal of Lietzmann's perturbations. The fact is, the historical picture shows a natural generation of asceticism from Christianity, at least in its Semitic-dominated forms. The spirituality of

the monks was perfectly consonant with a Spirit-governed Christology which esteemed Christ's prophetic work, and by which the individual's spiritual growth was seen to recapitulate that of the perfect man, Jesus (even to naked confrontation of Satan in the wilderness). The irrespressible character of the first monastics is as hard for the twentieth century modern to appreciate as that of the prophets who first gathered around Elijah, the prophetic patriarch who stood with Moses and Christ, and who was the prophet who would go before the Lord. The later forms, such as the monasticism of Basil and Benedict, or the writings of prophets like Isaiah and Jeremiah, are readily grasped, but not the untamable, most un-Western figures like Antony or Elijah. On any event, it is not for them to explain their seeming contrariness to "high aims of a philosophical and Christian kind," since, as Quispel so laconically observes,

Christianity has been interpreted in several ways, according to the genius of the peoples to whom it was entrusted: if Rome stressed the legal aspects of the new religion, and the Greeks developed an ontological interpretation of God and Christ, the Syrians were not very interested in dogmatic strife, at least until Ephrem Syrus in the fourth century, and conceived their faith rather as a Way, a way of life.⁹⁷

There remains a good deal to be applied from the example of the

← Palestinian-Syrian descended Christians.

IV. Where has this zig-zagging pilgrimage through five or six centuries of Christian origins and idiosyncratic spiritualities brought us? First, it becomes apparent that, exegetically, the biblical span of witness to the Holy Spirit reaches from what in /r the Old Testament are p/robably best described as sub-personal expressions to ones that are unmistakably personal in the New Testament. Of the many facets of New Testament Christology, the clear-

est-cut and even dominant is that in which the man Jesus Christ is seen as the Messiah-Prophet indwelt by the fullness of God, and that this divine character is primarily defined in terms of holiness. This in turn is expressed through the accounts of the relation of Christ to the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, the distinctly Palestinian ambience of the New Testament canon must be reckoned with if one is to grasp how seriously the prophetic life of the Savior is to be understood. For one thing, the New Testament's greater Palestinian-Jewish character that modern biblical and archaeological studies have brought to light makes plausible many of the older arguments that intricate theological speculation is alien to the kerygma, which for so long has been regarded as pure only when it appears primitive. Once it is established that there is an integrity of sophistication to the contents and formulations of the Holy Scriptures, then one is obligated to take seriously the instrumentality by which they came into existence--i.e., the original, Palestine-oriented Christian community.

On this basis a pattern slowly but unmistakably appears, one which under the manifold hermeneutical possibilities, has a particular claim on our attention. It suggests a rule, or canon of interpretation. In the Pentateuch this is visible in the way by which the canonical redactors, faced with Creation-accounts of distinct emphases, chose to begin with the so-called Priestly account. This in no way supplants the Yahwist account, obviously, but by complementing it also orientates the believing community's understanding of that unique, venerable and subsistent part of God's Word, Holy Scripture. Herbert W. Richardson has used exactly this method of taking canon as a point of departure for the purposes of

both hermeneutics and theological construction in the title-half of his essay Toward an American Theology.⁹⁸ In this essay I have tried to do the same with the New Testament canon, finding in it a fundamental commitment to life in the Holy Spirit, of which Christ's life is the model.

The New Testament canon begins with the Virgin Birth, or rather conception by the Holy Spirit whose intervention, ^{therefore} also marks the opening of canon. This I take to be that which the first theologians of the Church, above all the evangelists, felt we should make our starting point. By their time St. Paul's presentation of the Gospel, his experience of the Spirit, his speculations about the Law, and so forth, were all familiar. Taking for granted the inner conflicts within the fledgling Church, for which there is unmistakable evidence, I presume that they would have included the Jewish opposition to Paul's kind of speculations, which opposition persisted after all quite far beyond the time of the creation of the New Testament canon. The utter drama of Jesus confrontation with the Jewish establishment in the evangelists' portrayals must mean that Paul's stress on the differences between Law and grace was hardly isolated. In this light some patterns that appear in the Gospels may mean that there are less tenuous ties between them and the Pauline and related corpuses of canon than are generally admitted to. What some of the canon's formation must indicate is that in the grudging or accepting reception of the "Pauline" trend by the evangelists, they may still insist on emphases of their own, obviously informed by a variety of sources of like integrity, but such points as stressed by Paul--and (more importantly) it is to be hoped, by Jesus--left their mark.

Among these stands the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. There is no question but that Paul had a vivid spiritual life and high notions of the Spirit. Trying to imagine what the force of his conflict with traditional Jewish piety must have been like, one would imagine that part of the difficulty lay in that he was dealing with a tradition of great integrity. As we have seen from a brief look into the background of martyrdom, one feature of that piety was a sincere belief of the possibility of holiness through witness to Torah. Pharisaism is another expression of the same. By the time of the New Testament there was a Jewish tradition of martyrdom for the sake of Torah that had plainly caught the Christian community's eye. Jewish victims of persecution from earlier than even the Maccabeans were to inspire Christian martyrs well into the second and third centuries (Frend). So it would be beside the point to question the Jewish reverence for Torah.

What is not always clear and must be understood is that in the ordinary Jewish tradition the gift of holiness was not considered a gift of the Holy Spirit. The sectarians, on the other hand, apparently had made just that perception, as in the Qumran community, where a life of holiness was both a matter of loyalty to Torah and of perseverance in the Spirit and in the Way.⁹⁹ The Christian Church resolved the matter by separating the Spirit and holiness from the Torah, which is easily observable in Paul's debate. He had to demonstrate the subjectivity of Christ in Christian living--Christ as the subject and not only the object of faith. The Law is just a form, a structure whose function is to contain and control. The Spirit, however, dwells in man, bringing him too into the life of God in Christ, and giving man freedom as be-

fits the sons of God. Perfect freedom comes when holiness--the complete seal of the Spirit on life--is coextensive with human activity, when man has conquered through the power of the Spirit every trace of evil in and around himself. Christ is that man who from the very condition of his birth to his death on the Cross had that perfect freedom.

The rebirth of the rest of us men begins with baptism into Christ and life in the Spirit also, only to find ourselves likewise caught in a struggle that requires a cross in order that our freedom too may be perfected. There is a mysterious condition on all this, namely the mutuality of life in a community whose members submit themselves to one another, confess their sins to one another, exhort one another, make spiritual sacrifices for one another, even to the laying down of life, who are urged to love one another and be in perfect sympathy, as a Body over which are distributed the gifts of the Spirit, whose most beautiful manifestation is love. This abode of love is a free, elect nation of priests and prophets. This life of holiness, following in Christ's own steps and led in the Spirit of him who raised Christ from the dead, must be understood in a supremely ethical sense.

While no branch of the Church exists without the rich gifts of God, the spirituality of the Jewish-descended congregations makes a special claim to attention because of their continuity with the theological-spiritual frame of reference that we have seen in effect in the New Testament, although theirs is only one of at least three trends underway during the first three centuries.

First, in the Near East the Spirit-oriented, Semitic-related Christians arranged their life in community along sharp

ethical lines. The prophetic spirit prevailed, and the content of pious reflection--theology, christology--shaped itself accordingly. We have followed the growth and spread of that tradition from the New Testament to Syria, and have recognized its aptness for a thorough-going trinitarianism and christology, besides a vigorous life of asceticism which embodied the spiritual ideals.

Secondly, through a long summary of material covered by Frend, it has been possible to see the rise of a martyr tradition, whose growth in the East accompanied the spread of asceticism, but grew in the West (as seen in Montanism) without much exposure to the Asiatic asceticism, though by no means lacking in ascetical tendencies. Even here, however, the Holy Spirit was also central to Christian life, and more than once there has been occasion to mention Tertullian's own contributions to trinitarian development in connection with his fervid spirituality, his experience of the Spirit's personal reality.¹⁰⁰

Thirdly, there is the Apologist, Alexandrian expression of spirituality, actually a Logos-governed piety, as seen in Hippolytus, Clement and Origen. In their case the place of the Spirit is drastically subordinate, and it is no surprise to see in the examples of Hippolytus and Clement a lower-keyed attitude toward persecution and martyrdom.¹⁰¹ The latter group was the deepest involved in non-Christian platonistic philosophy and their efforts served to integrate tendencies within Christianity which might otherwise have been irreconcilable. Clement, for instance, becomes the first to identify the martyr and the ascetic. Origen, the Alexandrian-influenced Cappadocians, and Augustine, all eventually combine asceticism (especially celibacy) and clericalism in some

communal form by inspiration ~~form~~ platonic ideals and Syrian-spawned models. Without that integration, it is not clear that the fierce independence of the Church of the Confessors would have accepted the ascetics, for all their similarities, especially the prophet-like life in the Spirit.

What is it, however, that turns this review into something other than an exercise of antiquities? Why should it occupy one's attention at all? one of the first answers to these questions would answer back on the plane of history, which has mounted several ironies on one another with regard to Jewish Christianity. Already in the case of Islam and Manichaeism we have seen world-scale religions, Islam especially, which cannot be explained historically apart from reference to Christianity. Islam, the "religion of the Prophet," huddling at once a dervish spirituality and stolid intellectual poise, a re-cycling puritanism and a fraternal ethos, represents so often nowadays a judgment on failures of Christian witness as borne originally by Western society. This is patently so in much of western Africa, where Islam's appeal has spread in ⁶re~~act~~ion to the ugly associations of western colonialism and Christianity. The geographical distribution of Islam ~~ism~~ is respectable, and also heightens what Schoeps calls a "paradox of world proportions," since from the Middle East to the Indian sub-continent, to Indonesia and the Philippines, even to Caribbean America, Islam, dependent as it is at its birth on the Christianity we have glimpsed, unites a brotherhood of believers. Every last one of these areas represents a chapter in the record of Western domination of non-W~~W~~estern civilization in the name of Christ and in service of unjust ambition, a record which is con-

tinually exacerbated by the not always subtle drive for economic and political superiority of the West (capitalist or Marxist) over those same areas, and at their expense. Even short reflection on the "Third World" phenomenon of Islam ought to draw one's sight back to the rigorous asceticism of communal justice through common ownership of property, the discipline of poverty as a control over ambitions, and the glorification of prophetism, the harbingers of justice, that so radically distinguished Ebionite Christianity.

As if to cap the irony, the American Christian finds before him the heterodox Islamic manifestation of the Nation of Islam, the black Muslims, whose furious repudiation of Christianity in favor of Islam (again, the irony) arose in reaction to the legacy of racialism and the humiliation of slavery in America. Elijah Muhammed, but even more so Malcolm X, whose militant quest for truth and justice led him deep into orthodox Islam, symbolize as perhaps no other American black leaders the pathetic polarization of the world's poor, non-white, non-Christian (or where Christianity is a minority, non-Western) masses and the aggressively rich and white nations ~~[of the world]~~ as led by America. The spiritual rule by which even black Islam governs itself harks back finally to the spirit of prophetic justice, both by virtue of the clear-minded, undeceived insight of the oppressed and by information of the same faith, however tenuously at this point, that black Muslims through emulation of Islam share with the Judeo-Christian ethos. The irony of judgment consists in that the adherents of black Islam find Christian spirituality repugnant as a means of reaching their ends. Yet it is the historico-organic links of Christianity and Islam which--apart from a plain response to hu-

man solidarity--ought to interest and engage the heart-deep sympathy of the former faith in the latter, and in the plight of the peoples who adhere to Islam.

We have to go deeper, however, in finding a justification for the above excursion into the theology and spirituality of Jewish Christianity and its lineal descendants. There remain certain ^aanalogical ties to be noted. In discussing the history of Christian martyrdom there was chance to contrast the unanimity of goal and diversity of tactic under oppression of the Jewish people in Palestine and dispersion with those of the American black. The elusively fine line marking political or social motivations off from the religious (as if the distinction were always valid!) of Jewish zealots appears also in the action of Negro slave rebels (led as often as not by men raised up as preachers among their fellow slaves) and black separatists like those in Marcus Garvey's handmaid, the African Orthodox Church, and in Albert Cleage's effort to stir a following for a black Christ. As we saw further, however, the analogy applies not simply to the pre-Christian, pre-New Testament era, but also to the life of the Church in Syria and Egypt, where there was a direct correlation between the growth of a Christianity built on the faith of Apostles and prophets, and the disenchantment of the rural poor of the Egyptian and Syrian countryside. This in turn nurtured the lofty record of martyrdom and ascetical spirituality that grew up in those areas. There is no small resemblance between that and the ability of black America to survive white oppression by first of all internalizing Christian religion, and then proceeding to transcend at many points the witness of Christians in the white church which has been so

supportive of racist structures. Neither does it come as any surprise to recognize asceticism in the militant rejection of alcohol, drugs or marijuana, for instance, among black Muslims (or Panthers).

The current essays in black theology exploit such analogical touchpoints in still another way. That is, there is much interest invested in the fact that a Palestinian Jesus had to be a non-white, and speaking somewhat anachronistically, a non-Western Savior. (This is only partly anachronistic since we have seen how the religious environment of Palestine was early cut off from the primitive, Christian West, whose empire was based in Rome and Constantinople, and whose spiritual tastes were quite "turned off" by the enthusiastic extravagances of Semitic Christianity.) While for some like Cleage this means a requirement of a racially black Jesus, which I find tenuous at best and neglective of the solidarity of confrontation that all Third-world peoples share vis-à-vis the West, others find thematic reasons for a non-Western Jesus. What this depends on at root is a spiritual piety rather than an apologetic one. Thus Preston Williams scores modern Christianity's preoccupation with apologetic interests at the expense of facing the cultural and historical legacy of black America in a way that takes seriously the moral obstacles that have oppressed peoples like the Negro.¹⁰² This would include a religiosity which, because of its immersion in biblical simplicity from which the black church has learned a direct and tough grammar of spirituality, and because of black culture's aptness for spiritual enthusiasm, both of the other-worldly and social-activistic types, puts the black American church right in the tradition of Semitic Christianity

as we have discussed it. That includes an apocalyptic that is interested in angels and demons, justice and vengeance, and in an adaptation of prophetism in terms of wisdom and moralism.

Such are the hallmarks of Christianity conceived of more as a Way than as a philosophical apology. From such a milieu one may expect not so much to discover a christology cast in the language of apology as to find a prophetic, Spirit-oriented devotion to Jesus of Nazareth, the forthright confession and following of whom as Lord, liberator and Savior implies a high opinion of his person grounded in a trinitarian conviction. Again, that is the result of regarding him as not only he who sends the Spirit but as he who is naturally indwelt by him^{self} also--the perichoresis of the Godhead. This is as true of the fourth century churches radiating from Palestine as of the mainstream of black churches in America, to say nothing of the spirituality of the evangelical-pentecostal churches that circle the world, and generally subsist in the poor and disenfranchised masses. Nor is this to overlook the continued existence of such spirituality in non-Byzantine Eastern Christianity, such as the Ethiopian Church, the conscious model of separatist movements of some black sects in America. This coincidence of spiritual interests and social circumstances reflects what I would call an environment of an indwelling spirituality. It is significant, however, not as just an anthropo- or sociological phenomenon, but also because its continuity in fact and analogy from the very biblical times to the present cannot be readily exorcised from Christian belief and practice.

The sturdiness of spirituality so understood is not unmalleable when dealt with in more apologetic categories. We

saw this to be true in the theologies of Theodore and Nestorius, the Antiochene theologians who in their day "brought back the historical Jesus." The same adaptability can be demonstrated in black theology as James Cone derives it. He is able to re-organize the content of Barthian neo-orthodoxy to drive home the eschatological message of the New Testament gospel of liberation, thereby yielding a new creation, or formulation that proceeds from the spiritual experience of black American Christianity. Consider these statements:

Christ came into the world in order to destroy the works of Satan. . . . His whole life was a deliberate offensive against those powers which led man captive. Though the decisive battle has been fought and won (Easter), the war, however, is not over. . . . The crucial battle has been won already on the cross, but the campaign is not over. There is a constant battle between Christ and Satan, and it is going on now.¹⁰³

And also:

Authentic living according to the Spirit means that one's will becomes God's will, one's action becomes God's action. It could be that many will be excluded because their motives were ill founded. And this may mean that God is not necessarily at work in those places where the Word is truly preached and the sacraments are duly administered (as Reformation theologians defined the Church), but where the naked are clothed, the sick are visited, and the hungry are fed.¹⁰⁴

The first passage might as well have come from a treatise by Athanasius on atonement, or from John Chrysostom or John Damascene, for that matter. The second simply shows the origin and destiny of Cone's sympathies, a spirituality that comes from his formation within the Christianity of black America. (In the same connection one might approach Howard Thurman's essays on the Negro spiritual, and its profound meditation on death, as another tie between orthodox and black spirituality.

But what is this to say except that Athanasius, Chrysostom,

Gregory of Nyssa, et al., communicated to orthodoxy lessons taken from a spirituality to which they were precociously "hip"? Here is the active conception of evil as we examined it in the opening chapter, and the quest for dignity (before meaning) which requires a spirituality that does not always lie within the concern of most Western Christianity. Cone is plainly reacting to "Reformation" theology, although for reasons to emerge later, I believe he could go farther. In short, at this point I suppose that (Anglican that I am) I am only trying to show, so far by analogy, that just as the Palestinian ethos of the New Testament hardly failed with the decline of Palestine, the spirituality that characterizes something as contemporary as black theology has ancient and continuous precedent, a dimension which adds a catholic appeal by which both ends of the tradition illumine one another.

We must travel to still another stage, however, to understand the relevance of all that has gone before. If Cone may be compared to the Antiochene theologians for formalizing a traditional spirituality, Martin Luther King, Jr., may be cast in the role of taking up the mantle of praxis that comes down from the desert fathers and the monastic theorists. This is not meant allegorically since so many imprecisions would obtrude themselves. Rather it is to say that Dr. King shaped a movement according to a spiritual vision of reality which most completely summarizes the thrust of the prophecy-holiness theme that runs through the New Testament and the spirituality of Semitic Christianity--i.e., the particular message of a "Third World" Christianity. Furthermore, King himself embodied a peculiar critique of traditional Protestant theology, which critique likewise has as its source the heritage of being

black and Christian in America.

Speaking still in terms of analogy, one must say that King was not so much the monastic figure (for reasons other than the obvious!) as he was ~~of~~ the martyr, and where there is the possibility of martyrdom there is less need of the monk, whose stylized witness is to continue the martyr's deeds. Nevertheless, mutual strains sound in them. At first glance the style of withdrawal of the monk does not appear in King's non-violent movement. On the other hand, there is a marked parallel between the ascetical spiritual exercises of the desert monks and non-violence. The striving for a more perfect charity came through the acceptance of rigorous disciplines of poverty and obedience by which the monks came to purify their motives. Nothing is so important to non-violence, of course, as purity of motives, without which there exist too many dangers of gross moral presumption or psychological destruction. For the sake of the peaceable Kingdom, King urged the black (and white) militant to become a non-violent eunuch, accepting physical weakness in order to become channels of spiritual strength.

This, however, presupposes certain convictions about the nature of evil and its existence, as well as of good. King retained a vivid sense of evil as active and no mere privation of good. This necessarily involved him in spiritual behavior by which he acted accordingly. When reflecting on why the Negro non-violent movement might have begun in Alabama, King once observed:

So every rational explanation breaks down at some point. There is something about the protest that is suprarational; it cannot be explained without a divine dimension. . . . There is a creative power that works to pull down mountains of evil and level hilltops of injustice. . . . It seems as though God had decided to use Montgomery as the proving ground for the struggle and triumph of freedom and justice in America. And what better

place for it than the leading symbol of the Old South? It is one of the splendid ironies of our day that Montgomery, the Cradle of the Confederacy, is being transformed into Montgomery, the cradle of freedom and justice.¹⁰⁵

What does this recall if not the prophetic confrontation of the desert monks of the forces of evil at the heart of their private preserve? The non-violent militant goes unarmed except by the excellencies of the charismata against demonic forces, ^{in order} to make their own desert and solitary (white only) places of racism blossom with the roses of justice, freedom and peace, and to make them habitable.

The suffering which the militant thus accepts not only helps to revolutionize his inward reconstitution but also has a redemptive function where the wider community is concerned. This, however, demands a strategy of refusing to strengthen the existence of evil by resort to its own tactics:

Returning violence for violence multiplies violence, adding deeper darkness to a night already devoid of stars. Darkness cannot drive out darkness: only light can do that. Hate cannot drive out hate: only love can do that. The beauty of non-violence is that in its own way and in its own time it seeks to break the chain reaction of evil. With a majestic sense of spiritual power, it seeks to elevate truth, beauty and goodness to the throne. Therefore I will continue to follow this method because I think it is the most practically sound and morally excellent way for the Negro to achieve freedom.¹⁰⁶

The non-Christian may expectably balk at King's practical expectations of non-violence. The Christian, though, must pause over the issue of breaking "the chain reaction of evil," for it is pregnant with spiritual axioms that touch on all that we have discussed. It assumes the solidarity of mankind, so that the defeat of evil as violence by love in even just a few persons affects the destiny for good of the whole visibly and invisibly, which approximates a major strain of Christus-Victor soteriology. As we saw earlier, however, King's perception was as much strategic and rational as

mystical.) It means taking captivity captive, putting death to death, doing violence to violence. It also throws light on the monastic anachoresis: it was not so much a flight from as a flight to. Whatever scepticism or incomprehension we show of the monk's conviction of the ultimacy of his struggle with demons (the sceptic is tempted to overemphasize the superstitious element), one must admit that the achievements challenge doubt: charity, humility, fortitude, patience, simplicity of life and other fruits which have been matched by the modern Negro's struggle to be upgraded, to defend his dignity against forces that would destroy it. That in turn is accomplished through a self-love, and a love for others triumphing over death and the fear of death by casting the latter out. It is the hopeful, Resurrection life motivating present behavior. This is a major anticipation of the new theologies of hope.

The significance of King's theology is not to be explained only by analogy. He represents a synthesis far more complex than the simple contrasts I have ^adrawn since, obviously, his position as black in America bespeaks a long contact with white civilization, and the traditions of white Christianity. Yet the reason that King has to be mentioned at this point in our discussion of spirituality is because his spiritual synthesis demonstrates the penetration of a force within Western civilization to which it has been long-resistant. As Herbert Richardson has so emphasized, the sixteenth century Protestant Reformation, in treating the religious problem of defining the justification of fallen man, and of describing the forgiveness of sins, stopped far short of what might have been obtained. What failed in the Reformation was an appreciation

of the Holy Spirit as author of a new creation and personal holiness, ~~in order to~~ fulfill the work of God begun in Christ. To stop at an anthropology by which man seems incapable of response to such a spiritual work (so that Christ's righteousness, considered only as accounted to man became the definition of justification) suggested no understanding of man himself as spiritual being and "thwarted" the Spirit's work.

The magisterial Reformers and their immediate successors did not exclude or depreciate the Spirit as a vital part of the communal life of the Church unwittingly. By their very omission of this emphasis--an emphasis that was central to the Anabaptist, Quaker, Leveler, and Antinomian groups that were also emerging at this time--they arranged to keep the Church, the forgiveness of sins, and everlasting life out of the hands of the Spirit (represented by the revolutionaries) and in the hands of Christ who, being absent, had to be represented by His vicar on earth--whether pope, preacher, prince or presbytery (the representatives of established privilege and property). 'The time of the Spirit is not yet,' they said. 'And the place of the Spirit is not here. The Spirit belongs to eschatology; the Spirit belongs to another age.'¹⁰⁷

We discussed this problem and its social implications in the opening chapter. Richardson finds that the Reformation finally did take place in the eighteenth century in the movements headed by Jonathan Edwards and John Wesley with the consequence that corresponding social movements were also born to act out the implications of the new spirituality. On the European continent atheistic, secularist, and Marxist solutions became the principles by which privilege was overthrown and society reformed.

In England and in North America, however, the true Protestant Reformation itself was the revolutionary vanguard. It was Wesley who mobilized the poor in England, though it was Marx who mobilized the poor on the continent. It was Wilberforce and Parker and the revivalists of the second Great Awakening who mobilized the conscience of men against slavery. It was the Baptist, Walter Rauschenbusch, who formulated the definitive theology of the social gospel and the Baptist Martin Luther King who led the struggle against the

use of war and violence as methods for settling human conflicts. Such movements presuppose the spiritualist vision of man.¹⁰⁸

The movements which grew up around this spirituality also pitted themselves against child labor abuses, advocated woman suffrage, so much so that in time "The Protestant Church had become a complex conglomerate benevolence society--a communio sanctorum filled with the desire for holiness and struggling for the creation of a holy world."¹⁰⁹

It might be added that in reality this movement represents a far older dialectic within Western society than the Reformation can tell by itself. One quickly perceives that the leavening influence of the spiritualist has never been absent: the Montanist, the Donatist, the earlier forms of European monasticism by which Christianity evangelized the heathen continent, the medieval utopians and millennialists, like the prophetic Franciscans and countless others. It must also be added that the enthusiastic Protestantism extends the spiritual enterprise to everyone, not just a few.

As I have tried to show, however, the Protestant context is not the only one in which King is to be understood. Certainly his Baptist background must be regarded with the black community in mind, in which King the man was tutored, and for which he struggled. His intellectual autobiography, traced most explicitly in Stride toward Freedom in the chapter "Pilgrimage to Non-violence," expanded the limits of the formative community through which he passed to include thinkers and leaders like Thoreau, Tolstoy, Hegel, Rauschenbusch, Tillich, Wieman, and Reinhold Niebuhr among others. There was his careful exploration of personal-

istic philosophy, the theory that the clue to the meaning of ultimate reality is found in personality, which gave him an articulation for a lifetime:

Personalism's insistence that only personality--finite and infinite--is ultimately real strengthened me in two convictions: it gave me metaphysical and philosophical grounding for the idea of a personal God, and it gave me a metaphysical basis for the dignity and worth of all human personality.¹¹⁰

At this point King was brought to a break with academic Protestant orthodoxy by projecting theology from a metaphysical base--which puts him outside the pale of Barthian and Niebuhrian interests. The content of his metaphysic--motion from personality to Personality, and vice-versa--implies a trust in the universe which would make sense to few existentialists. His conviction about the structures of reality--metaphysically informed--bound him to an unswerving belief in non-violence and metaphysical views of justice and of a universe whose "arc bends toward justice." The same sympathy pits King against part of situation ethics--certainly not the "norm" of love--but against the absence of a metaphysical definition of reality, against the relativism that subverts King's strategy of non-violence, based as it is on metaphysical assumptions.

Symbolically this all represents a withdrawal, an anachoresis, from the acceptable way of doing things. By upholding such a view, King thus envisions man, even sinful, fallen/man, as retaining the image of God--God and man as spiritual beings--and therefore therapeutically responsive to the healing work of God. Forgiveness and reconciliation actually break the chain reactions of evil and sin, raising man's dignity to preservation from annihilation, "never overcome because always forgiven." What love

may achieve between individuals, justice may be expected to achieve between peoples. This conviction was not easily come by for King, since he was also able to internalize much of the hard-nosed realism of Reinhold Niebuhr, whose criticisms of pacifism as morally naïve were enough to keep even King from joining a pacifist group during his years of preparation before a public ministry.

Niebuhr's great contribution to contemporary theology is that he has refuted the false optimism characteristic of a great segment of Protestant liberalism, without falling into the anti-rationalism of the continental theologian Karl Barth, or the semi-fundamentalism of other dialectical theologians. Moreover, Niebuhr has extraordinary insight into human nature, especially the behavior of nations and social groups. While I still believed in man's potential for good, Niebuhr made me realize his potential for evil as well . . . (and) helped me to recognize the complexity of man's social involvement and the glaring reality of collective evil.¹¹¹

King finally turned away from Niebuhr's emphasis, however, because of a different vision of Christian anthropology:

I came to see that Niebuhr had overemphasized the corruption of human nature. His pessimism concerning human nature was not balanced by an optimism concerning divine nature. He was so involved in diagnosing man's sickness of sin that he overlooked the cure of grace.¹¹² *

There is cause for wonderment at this evolution of King's thought. His predisposition to the "passion for social justice" and "sympathy for pacifism" of the men who tutored his theological and spiritual formation closed the circuit of a vast historical current. The professors of his Methodist school of theology shared with liberal Protestantism in America the legacy of descent from the spiritual awakening led so magnificently by Edwards and Wesley.

*The same makes me tend to recoil at Cone's use of the concept of "man's radical (depravity)" to describe white moral bankruptcy. That is a retention from Protestant orthodoxy, and makes the white man's guilt too facile.

But who are they? Edwards, a theologian who ranked high in his ~~pr~~ priorities a studied recovery of the Holy Spirit's equal dignity with the Father and the Son as God; Wesley, an avid student not only of Moravian and Puritan (of Edwards) piety, but also of Macarius the Egyptian and Ephrem of Edessa.

That is, the theology born of a spirituality which we have here taken space to examine, a spirituality which plumbs the riches of a holiness-prophetic christology that distinguished Palestinian-descended Christianity, comes to rest in King. Not only is that true, but by redirecting this synthesis to the life of the Negro in America, and blending it with the similarly disposed spirituality of the black church of the South, King integrated actual and analogical elements from what I have called the environment of an indwelling spirituality, an environment of a struggle for life over death, dignity over corruption, justice over injustice, in which a dialectic of striving in the Spirit^{as} always been present.

Richardson is content to call this American theology, and defends its integrity against the sneering disbelief of European secularism as of Bonhoeffer or Niebuhr, or any of the critics who have held that there is no authentic American theological tradition. I would like to go beyond Richardson, however, to show that the phenomenon is not strictly Protestant, that it is not only analogous to Orthodoxy and ecumenical Christianity, but that the phenomenon is as old as, and ineffably indebted to Palestine, Syria and Egypt, whose example and actual contact have helped to revitalize Christianity innumerable times. In modern terms, this is spirituality from the Third World addressing itself to the confusion of Western Christianity which has ever been so ambivalent about the

Holy Spirit.

The black church, also presumably without an integral theological tradition, comes to a sudden flowering in King so that for the time being, black theology is American theology. There is a vocational timeliness about all this which has not been lost on black leadership. It relates to what Vincent Harding calls the "gift of blackness" in what Nat Hentoff calls the "time of blackness." That this upsurge has occurred within the bounds of oppressive society suggested to King (and here he admitted to "abbit of chauvinism") that American civilization is imperiled unless

the black man in America can provide a new soul force for all Americans, a new expression of the American dream that need not be realized at the expense of other men around the world, but a dream of opportunity and life that can be shared with the rest of the world.¹¹³

What King would claim generally for the revolutionizing leaven of the disenfranchised world's struggle upwards the present essay would say has become a dispensation in the narrower field of Christian renewal. In reality, therefore, the environment of enthusiasm, of the spirituality of indwelling, is one that the Holy Spirit himself creates: not the sordid, rankling atmosphere of impoverishment, cruelty and injustice, which happen to result from the inner contradictions of man's immorality; but the air of striving by which old values are reversed, the strength of wearied men is renewed and the will and glory of God are manifested.

Where the Holy Spirit moves, the satellites of all that is subsumed under holiness cluster ^{about} ~~around~~ him. First there is truth, by which the Lord consecrated himself and through the coming of the Paraclete, sanctifies all who become his disciples; truth, which is the absolute condition of freedom; the truth about oneself, but al-

so about God, which sets men at liberty; truth, so immense and mysterious as to humble, and be awful. Then there is freedom itself, which penetrates the interior being, giving courage, joy and dignity to man; freedom which lifts clouds from the soul and mind; but also freedom which is not satisfied until the whole creature has been lifted from the encircling oppression of evil and death and the fear thereof; by which life becomes livable, with power for autonomy, and capable of being fulfilled, though also of being left by a holy death, so that existence may be more perfectly fulfilled. Where truth and freedom operate, purity can exist: purity of heart; purity of motive; purity of act, and innocence. Where the Spirit of truth and freedom moves, love and justice must also go; love which rescues purity; hence, love which forgives (self and others); love which satisfies justice; justice which safeguards freedom. There is also peace: peace which flows when justice obtains; peace which is fruit of a clear and forgiven conscience; peace that so defies comprehension that it must be a gift.

This is but a fragment of what holiness is, for in the end, holiness is something which only God himself can sustain with perfect consistency since apart from him it is impossible. Only where he is, is there holiness, and that is why the Spirit must be God in person. The biblical language of the Spirit as a pledge in man's heart is an image of commerce, something negotiable, redemptive of man's own possibilities. Man is created apt for holiness, which aptness sin enfeebles, but fallen man's nature still implies holiness as well as sin. The coming of the Spirit, then, not only strengthens and renews what is feeble and otherwise lost

but also brings the individual into the presence of holiness. That is the import of the canon--not only God-for-us, which is implied in strictly Messianic soteriology, where Spirit is equated with ~~==~~ power, but also God-with-us, where God, present in glory, is an end in himself, which becomes the other reason for the Spirit's participation in the Incarnation.

Holiness is ethical--implying society--because it is a fruit of the Spirit, another feature of whose work is to unite. Neither the distribution of his gifts nor himself can be diminished by the giving; rather he is the source of the mystery by which men are able to exceed their own natural capacities, a "machinery," as Richardson has proposed, of transcendence. He is the opposite of entropy. The Spirit who intercedes in the heart of the community prays for more than it could ever know to, extends the effect of its loving sacrifices farther than it could ever imagine. Yet man is feeble, and proceeds haltingly on hope gained through the experience of joy, and the other gifts of holiness, that God is continually at work to achieve wholly what the individual has known only by foretaste, only by pledge.

To be swept up into the existence of holiness is the vision of him who has a spiritual vision of man and society. It is a vision often plagued by naïveté and seduced into self-delusion, but it is implied by the image of God in man. Mohandas K. Gandhi perhaps roused that vision in King as no one else after Jesus was able. This also bears elements of irony, since the interpenetration of cultural influences affecting the thought and life of Gandhi and King is intricate beyond description. Gandhi, originally drawn to the ideals of Jesus and impressed by the articula-

tions of Thoreau, did not forget these influences, but on returning to his native India, he recast them in categories drawn from the genius of the Hindu (and with no small sprinkling of chauvinism on his own part in the sense that King ascribed it to himself). Civil disobedience joined to the pacifistic mysticism of the Bhagavad-Gita (which had influenced Thoreau) sought to serve the vindication of truth by suffering freely accepted in order to unseat evil. As for St. Paul, suffering sustained on faith in hope of such a vindication was regarded by Gandhi as purifying. This order held because no one could be said to know enough of truth to command another's death. There is only one adequate source of strength to accept and bear suffering, and that derives from love, love which unleashes the drive to resist evil by overcoming its provocations. Such love can induce shame and compunction in the antagonist who inflicts the violent harm. Such love is simultaneously disciplined and displayed by ascetical self-offerings like fasting, intense prayer vigil and active confrontation of the adversary.

That the lesson did not escape King is obvious and well studied. He synthesized still another historical intricacy by bringing the life-style of satyagraha (satya-truth, love; graha, force), now called soul-force, back to the homeland of modern civil disobedience. It released a force that shattered the evil obstinacies of racism in the manner of the hermit being driven by the Spirit into combat in the wilderness, opening a stream which with other collective forces has become a torrent in contemporary America. What interests us here is that in submitting himself to truth and love, Gandhi the non-Christian was pursuing a pre-emi-

nently spiritual path of holiness. Truth cannot be divided, nor can love. Gathered about Gandhi's war of love were many of the elements which appear in the Spirit-created environment of enthusiasm, such as the askesis, the athletic disciplining which increases the aptness for spiritual strength, even to the willingness to die. This also included for Gandhi an ashramic celibacy; asceticism in service of holiness requires a community.

Where did he get such a vision? After all the influences of Christian literature and Thoreau are allowed for, one is bound to respect the integrity of the Indian saint's inspiration. Together with King he intensifies the image of non-Western civilization's challenge to the West, whose prosperity has met the blind-end of moral folly, preferring the existence of its own spirit and visions rather than the existence of the Spirit of holiness, thereby purveying much moral evil and unnecessary suffering, and obstructing the creation of a truly new world. While the West has no monopoly on violence--the rest of the world also remains stubbornly ambitious--Gandhi and King have stood for resistance to that which in Western history has become a brand--~~violence~~ and racism, two of the most naked assaults on the dignity of spiritual being, productive not of life but of death. The theology of King also formalizes an intellectual resistance to racist, Western dehumanization by the spiritual vision of man informed by (Western) social sciences and metaphysical ^a a prioribus alien to at least Protestant orthodoxy. Such an intellectual synthesis is important to preserving the quest for a holy society from the anti-rationalism and sanctimony of past spiritualist movements. Nonetheless, the hermit, King and Gandhi alike pose a judgment to the intellectual enthusiast

who may settle for less than the full eschatological vision (holiness as well as power to renew; moral power in lieu of powerless morality or immoral power), a perennial temptation for the secularist. And the achievement of Gandhi warns against Christian spiritual chauvinism. The Spirit blows where he wills to over an estate--our universe-- whose agent he is with the Father and the Son. He may well be at work laying out stakes in it in ~~the~~ corners where the Church has yet to arrive. Gandhi's Truth is a testament to the Father's providence, the Son's love, and the Spirit's freedom. Maybe what is necessary to contemplate such truth more reverently is a vision like Teilhard's, greater even than King's in its reverie over the cosmic but transcendent Christ, filling, by the Spirit, all that exists with the beauty of his own love.

Notes to Chapter Two

- ¹Herbert W. Richardson, Toward an American Theology, New York, 1967; p. 108.
- ²Bonhoeffer, No Rusty Swords, quoted by Richardson, op. cit., p. 110.
- ³Richardson, op. cit., p. 110.
- ⁴Martin Luther King, Jr., Where Do We Go from Here: Chaos or Community?, N.Y., 1967, p. 210.
- ⁵Gustaf Aulen, Christus Victor, 1968 edition (MacMillan).
- ⁶See H. Berkhof, The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, Richmond, 1964, p. 17f for a connected use of the term.
- ⁷John 14:16, 23, Jerusalem Bible, N.Y., 1966.
- ⁸Berkhof, op. cit., p. 23.
- ⁹Sjöberg, "PNEUMA," Theological Wordbook of the New Testament,^{vi} ed. Kittel, Grand Rapids, 1968; sections C/III/5/a.
- ¹⁰ibid.
- ¹¹ibid., section -/5/d.
- ¹²ibid., section -/5/c.
- ¹³ibid.,
- ¹⁴See note "b.," on Isa. 11:2, Jerusalem Bible.
- ¹⁵Sjöberg, loc. cit., C./III/5/e/(b)
- ¹⁶ibid., -/5/e/(c)
- ¹⁷ibid.
- ¹⁸ibid., D./1,2.
- ¹⁹ibid., C/III/5/e/(d, g).
- ²⁰I would therefore disagree with Schweitzer's comments about the lack of mention of the Spirit in John's prologue: that because in a realized eschatology like his Christ must have the full value of God, God himself and not his gift (the Spirit) is encountered in Christ (Schweitzer, II/6/D/1), and that conception by the Spirit exists only for believers and not for the Son. For one, John's obvious use in the prologue of the Genesis creation story (1:2) suggests not simply an hypostasis of the Word (logos), but of the Spirit also because of the very analogy. That is, the Spirit is in the background of the Incarnation even for John. Besides, the Baptist's comment at 3:4 suggests that Christ's immeasurable bond with the Spirit originates from the very mission of the Son from God. At no point does Schweitzer cite that passage, however.
- ²¹Schweitzer, loc. cit., agrees with the opposite opinion, that Jesus was probably a pneumatic, though for reasons bound to the dawn of the Messianic age, at which the Spirit was expected to appear (see above), he could not openly speak of the Spirit, who consequently appears little in Matt., Mark, and more frequently in Luke.
- ²²Barrett, Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition, London, 1947; p. 6.
- ²³ibid., p. 16.
- ²⁴ibid.
- ²⁵ibid., p. 20.
- ²⁶ibid., p. 23.
- ²⁷ibid.
- ²⁸In a Targum to Cant.2:12 (the voice of the turtledove) there is the phrase "the voice

- ²⁸ of the Holy Spirit of Salvation." Barrett quotes the following Ben Zoma tale: Bal. Hag. 15a "Rabbi Joshua the son of Hananiah was standing on an ascent on the Temple Mount, and Ben Zoma saw him but did not stand before him. He said to him: Whence comest thou and whither go thy thoughts, Ben Zoma? He replied: I was considering the space between the upper waters and the lower waters, and there is only between them a three fingers' breadth, as it is said, and the Spirit of God was brooding on the face of the waters like a dove who broods over her young but does not touch them." Viz., Barrett, op. cit., p. 38.
- ²⁹ Barrett summarizes the following account of the baptism from a scholar named Leisegang: Corresponding to the account of the mysterious begetting of the body of Jesus (given in Mt. and Lk.) there is also an equivalent soul-begetting associated with baptism. Of this we have altogether six accounts in Mt., Mk., Lk., Jn., the Gospel of the Ebionites and the Gospel of the Hebrews. In each of these the Spirit appears either in the form of a dove, or as light or as a spring, and in each case the presence of the Spirit is adduced as proof, or at least connected with the statement that Jesus is the Son of God. The significance of the dove-form is to bring out clearly the fact that the Spirit (in Hebrew ruah) is a female principle, over against God the Father as a male principle...In the canonical Gospels the mythology is suppressed, and consequently the dove is left over as an unexplained (and as it stands inexplicable) symbol." Barrett, p. 36. An entirely different option about how to regard the literature cited here, an option unavailable to either of these writers, will appear below.
- ³⁰ Barrett, op. cit., explains how in Rabbinic Judaism the periphrasis bath qol, "daughter of the voice" virtually meant the second best thing to direct revelation from God: "The usual notion of the bath qol or voice from heaven is that of an inferior inspiration by the Holy Spirit." This has to do with the impact of the close of canon on Judaism, and the subsequent rise of the Wisdom tradition, something I think Barrett overlooks, and for that reason is pressing the Rabbinic sources too much.
- ³¹ ibid., p. 16, 17.
- ³² Schweitzer, loc. cit., E/II/4; also, see below.
- ³³ ibid., E/II/3.
- ³⁴ ibid., loc. cit.
- ³⁵ ibid., E/I/7.
- ³⁶ Matt. 1:18, 20-23, Revised Standard Version, N.Y., 1946.
- ³⁷ Luke 1:35 (RSV).
- ³⁸ e.g., Creed, The Gospel According to St. Luke, London, 1930; p. 20 on v. 1:35.
- ³⁹ ibid.
- ⁴⁰ The groundwork for studies in the primitive Jewish trinitarianism was done by J. Barbel, Christos Angelos, and G. Kretschmar, Studien zur fruechristlichen Trinitaets-theologie. See also, Danielou, The Theology of Jewish Christianity, Vol. I, transl. Baker, Chicago, 1964; and G. Quispel in his introduction to his edition of Das Thomasevangelium. The Schoeps work cited below deals mostly with the unsuccessful heterodox Jewish Christian groups, while the authors mentioned here, except for Quispel, are concerned with the mainstream Jewish Christian strand.
- ⁴¹ Barrett, op. cit., p. 7.

- ⁴² Danielou, *op. cit.*, says that "Once the archangels came to be considered six in number (an alteration of the Jewish tradition by the Jewish Christians) with the Word as their chief, it was natural that...the name of Michael, which is the title of this chief, should be attributed to the Word." This tradition, he says, is attested by "Harnack, Seeberg, and the majority of critics." (p. 124ff). See also, II Enoch (xxii, 4-9), Test. Dan, Levi (vi, 2) and (v, 6) respectively, where according to Danielou the angel who is called "a mediator between God and men" is Michael. Cf., in a similar vein, I Tim. 2:5; p. 125.
- ⁴³ ibid., p. 127.
- ⁴⁴ ibid.
- ⁴⁵ ibid.
- ⁴⁶ ibid., p. 130
- ⁴⁷ ibid., p. 127
- ⁴⁸ The following example from Jewish Christianity with Gnostic contacts shows what happens in the other case. Here Christ is represented as saying, "I took the form of the angel Gabriel, I appeared unto Mary and spoke with her; her heart accepted me; she believed and laughed. I, the Word, entered into her and became flesh. And I myself became a minister unto myself...It was in the appearance of an angel that I acted thus. Thereafter did I return to my Father." (Epistle of the Apostles, 14; PO ix, 198; cited by Danielous)
- ⁴⁹ In any case I think the foregoing evidence carries us that much beyond the following opinion of Sjöberg (TWNT) about the extremem personification of the Spirit in Rabbinic and other pre-NT sources (C/III/5/e/(g)): 'For this reason it has often been thought that the Spirit is regarded in Judaism as a hypostasis, as a personal angelic being... (But) the Spirit is no angelic being or heavenly being (a f.n. on Mowinckel's use of the Asc. of Isa. follows here, but Sjöberg rejects it for its Christian Character)... One might call him a hypostasis if one intends to express His independent action thereby...(However), the personal categories used to describe the activity of the Spirit are not designed to present Him as a special Heavenly being but rather to bring out the fact that He is an objective divine reality which encounters and claims man.' This, one would think is true regarding the Jews, but it also serves to show the starting point of the Jewish Christian corrections.
- ⁵⁰ Macarius, in homily 30:2,3, speaks of our birth from above as coming "of the womb of the Spirit," Fifty Spiritual Homilies of S. Macarius of Egypt, transl. A.J. Mason, N.Y., 1921.
- ⁵¹ See Schweitzer, loc. cit., E/II/1, and f.n. 463 on p. 405.
- ⁵² ibid.
- ⁵³ Berkhof, op. cit., p. 17.
- ⁵⁴ Richardson, *op. cit.*, "This 'God-man' formula is a summary of the confession of Chalcedon (451 A.D.), in which the God-manhood of Jesus is understood to mean that He possesses two natures. He is one person (prosopon) who is perfect both in deity (theotēti) and in humanity (anthropotēti)." P. 133f.
- ⁵⁵ From Theodore's homiletical catechism; quoted by J.N.D. Kelly in *Early Christian Doctrines*, London, 1958; p. 204.
- ⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 305.
- ⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 302.
- ⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 308.

⁵⁹Ibid.

⁶⁰The difference between them is assessed by Richardson, op. cit., as follows:
 "Chalcedonian Christology" is dyadic, Constantinopolitan Christology is triadic...
 The dyadic formula explains Jesus simply in terms of His two natures. The triadic
 formula explains Jesus not only in terms of his two natures, but also by defining
 His person: 'the God who is God-man (the two natures)!' P. 137.

⁶¹G. Quispel, "On Jewish Christianity," Vigiliae Christianae, Vol. 22, 1968; p. 81.

⁶²A.J. Schoeps, Jewish Christianity, Factional Disputes in the Early Church, transl.
 Douglas Hare, Philadelphia; 1969.

⁶³Ibid., p. 10-11.

⁶⁴Ibid., viz. p. 103.

⁶⁵Ibid.

⁶⁶Ibid., p. 102

⁶⁷Ibid.

⁶⁸Quispel, loc. cit., p. 83.

⁶⁹Schoeps, op. cit., p. 111.

⁷⁰Ibid., p. 114. Schoeps goes on, "In terms of content, the better righteousness, as
 practical morality, suggests: 'If you love your brethren, you will take nothing from
 them but will rather give to them from your possessions; you will feed the hungry;
 give a drink to the thirsty, clothe the naked, care for the sick, help those in pri-
 sons as much as you can, receive strangers gladly into your dwellings, hate no one.'
 (Hom. 3.69 and par.-Kerygmata Petrou)."

⁷¹Ibid., p. 129.

⁷²Ibid., p. 136.

⁷³Ibid., p. 140.

⁷⁴Quispel, loc. cit., p. 92f.

⁷⁵Ibid., p. 87.

⁷⁶Ibid. Quispel adds, "There is now evidence from the Sassanid empire to prove that
 in the third century 'Christians' and 'Nazorees' were still distinguished. The for-
 mer arrived only with the conquest of Antioch by a man named Shapur."

⁷⁷Ibid., p. 86. Apparently this same link was advanced by a scholar named Burkett, who
 later retracted the argument.

⁷⁸Ibid., p. 90: Quispel feels that Macarius was used by Gregory. The opposite view is ad-
 vanced by W. Jaeger in an introduction to a new reconstruction of Macarius' letter.

⁷⁹Even the name of the writer is not clear. Tradition speaks of Macarius, scholarship
 of Symeon (cf. Lietzmann, The Era of the Church Fathers, Vol. IV, London, 1951; p. 182.

⁷⁹Quispel, loc. cit., p. 90.

⁸⁰Lietzmann, op. cit., p. 125.

⁸¹Ibid., p. 132.

⁸²Ibid., p. 132-33.

⁸³W.H.C. Frend, Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Christian Church, Oxford, 1965.

- ⁸⁴Ibid., pp. 1-20 passim. Frend describes Irenaeus as a millennialist who felt that the Church was under mission under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. "Where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church and all grace." Irenaeus also felt that "the witness of the Church was being proclaimed through martyrs and demonstrated by prophetic individuals possessed of spiritual gifts. Like the Montanists, he felt that confessors might claim to be able to forgive sins, that the Spirit supported them with insensitivity to pain, the direct reward of conversation with Christ, but at the same time, Irenaeus' group managed to escape the unflexing rigorism of Montanism." Pp. 16f, 348ff.
- ⁸⁵Ibid., p. 47.
- ⁸⁶Ibid., p. 44.
- ⁸⁷Ibid., p. 54.
- ⁸⁸Ibid., p. 65.
- ⁸⁹Ibid., p. 91.
- ⁹⁰Ibid. He adds, "Like Ignatius of Antioch, the martyrs at Lyons, and the Donatist confessors of the fourth century, Perpetua and her companions were set on one thing only, the imitation of their Lord through martyrdom. In prison they felt themselves to be under the direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Their baptism by water was simply the preliminary to the real baptism of blood. They were to request nothing of the Spirit in the baptismal waters'except the sufferings of the flesh.'" P. 91.
- ⁹¹Ibid., p. 376. "Hippolytus failed to develop a doctrine of the Holy Spirit. His opponents reproached him for ditheism, perhaps correctly. In any event he thought of the Godhead in terms of God-Logos, rather than Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Thus his theology of martyrdom lacked the boldness and logical consistency of Tertullian's."
- ⁹²Lietzmann, op. cit., p. 163.
- ⁹³Frend, op. cit., p. 457.
- ⁹⁴Ibid., p. 548. "Already during the Great Persecution the way was being prepared for the monk to take up the mantle of the martyr. Many of the Egyptian and Palestinian martyrs combined the qualities of both. In these years Christians were beginning to share Antony's solitude, while Antony himself went down from Pispis to Alexandria to encourage the confessors in their defiance of Maximin's officials...With the ending of the persecution the substitution of ascetic for martyr as the highest of Christian goals became complete."
- ⁹⁵Ibid., p. 549; cf. also p. 462 about anachorēsis.
- ⁹⁶Ibid., p. 462. In light of the structure of this essay Frend's evaluation is to the point.
- ⁹⁷Lietzmann, op. cit., p. 135.
- ⁹⁸Ibid., p. 138.
- ⁹⁹Quispel, op. cit., p. 81-82.
- ¹⁰⁰Richardson, op. cit.; see the section, "The Sabbath As Sacrament," p. 112ff.
- ¹⁰¹From the Scroll of the Rule: "...He shall not be absolved by atonement, nor purified by lustral waters, nor sanctified by seas and rivers, nor cleansed by all the waters of washing. Unclean, unclean he shall be for as long as he scorns the ordinances of God, and allows not himself to be taught by the community of His Council. For by the

Spirit of true counsel concerning the ways of man shall all his sins be atoned when he beholds the light of life. By the Holy Spirit of the Community, in His Truth shall he be cleansed of all his sins; and by the Spirit of uprightness and humility shall his flesh be cleansed when sprinkled with lustral water and sanctified in flowing water." Scroll of the Rule, III:4-9, translation of A. Dupont-Sommer.

- 102 Preston N. Williams, "The Ethical Aspects of the 'Black Church/Black Theology' Phenomenon," Journal of Religious Thought, 26/2 (Summer Supplement, 1969); pp. 34-45.
- 103 James Cone, Black Theology and Black Power, N.Y., 1969; p. 40 (from a passage analyzing the meaning of freedom).
- 104 Ibid., p. 59.
- 105 King, Stride Toward Freedom, N.Y., 1958; p. 51f.
- 106 King, op. cit., p. 72f.
- 107 Richardson, "Holy Spirit and Protestantism," Commonweal, Nov. 8, 1968; p. 194f.
- 108 Ibid., p. 197.
- 109 Ibid.
- 110 Ibid., p. 80f.
- 111 King., op. cit., p. 82 (Stride).
- 112 Ibid., p. 82.
- 113 King, "A Testament of Hope," Playboy, Vol. 15, No. 1, 1970; p. 234. After noting the impact of Jesus the property-less, the author of no book, the article concludes, "He changed the course of mankind with only the poor and the despised. Naive and unsophisticated though we may be, the poor and despised of the 20thth (sib) century will revolutionize this era. In our 'arrogance, lawlessness and ingratitude,' we will fight for human justice, brotherhood, and secure peace and abundance for all. When we have won these - in a spirit of unshakable non-violence - then, in the luminous splendor, the Christian era will truly begin." P. 236.

POSTSCRIPT TO CHAPTER II

Since so unaccustomed an emphasis on spirituality and christology in terms of prophetism might be taken to exclude those interpretations which are more traditional, it would be in order to say something about those which, as the leading concept, are based on something other than Christ's prophetic work. After all, the New Covenant is new not because it obliterates what has been in order to begin afresh, but because it is new to those who formerly had lived outside of the knowledge of God's promises, and gives an utterly new orientation to the older promises which had graced the people of Israel. Judah was his sanctuary, but the Lord annexed to it many new mansions, and performed some radical restructuring of the old Temple before taking up residence once again. There is something new in Christian prophecy, in the Christian fealty; the Messiah in the New Testament is not Jewish but Christian. The novelty, however, unpredictable as it was, was not inconsistent with what Israel had been traditionally taught to expect of him who was with her. That is all summed up in the Virgin Birth and Incarnation of God, Emmanuel, and in that truth we are faced with the invasion of the holy into our midst, the coming of him sent from the Father by the Son.

Christology is to be symbolized by more than simply the images of Prophet, Priest and King, since the mutual blend of these roles is transcended by others fulfilled by Christ: the suffering

servant, the judge, the friend, the teacher, and so on. There is only one adequate repository of such richness--the person of God himself, Father, Son, and Spirit, who is also man. The full manifestation of the Godhead is required in any christological discussion, therefore, for in no way does God withhold himself from revelation in Jesus. So in any case, spirituality - life in the spirit by which the life of Christ is recapitulated and extended - will flow from all interpretations of Christ, although these will overlap themselves elaborately.

At one moment the Church finds herself sustained by the Spirit in Christ the King, who unseats every lesser emperor. The Spirit comforts, strengthens, and inspires those who suffer for their loyalty, but who likewise hope to cast down crowns of their own at God's feet. So also devotion rises to Christ the Priest, the reconciler, mediator, and offerer. Here too the Spirit is required in the community - for the forgiveness of sins, for the restoration of fellowship, for the offering sweet-savory sacrifices. Christ the Prophet reminds the forgetfully ambitious who it is that is still enthroned; he is the original Protestant principle.

Should the Spirit "disappear" from any such works of God in Christ, then the Christian community quickly lapses from its fealty (duty to the King by living in his holiness), from priestly offering and reconciling work, and from prophetic concern. This failing happens when the best of intentions miscarry. The catholic may try to honor Christ by revering his vicar, the Pope, the council, but then the Spirit may get "locked-up", as it were, in the Church. The protestant may wish to honor the Father for the Son's

unique mediationship, but in the process, the reconciling and sacrificial work the Church should perform, and for which the Spirit is sent, may be mistakenly suppressed. The enthusiast may so rejoice in the joy and peace of the Spirit that he forgets the ethical- the social - extensions of holiness. Another kind of enthusiast may become too adept at wielding power to defeat power wrongly used, and thus forget the other half of the apocalyptic vision - not just war, but also worship in heaven and earth. In every case the desire is to glorify God, but glorification of God the Spirit is somehow too easily by-passed.

With christology as a clue, then, several possible variations on a spiritual anthropology exist. In the first chapter it was mentioned that Incarnationalist and Spiritualist theologies have similarly high expectations of even fallen man's capacities. That the former, associated with Catholic schools, so believes, is seen in the appeal to metaphysics and to a therapeutic-sacramental life of grace, and is seen in the belief that even fallen man can respond to natural laws of justice whose ultimate origin is beyond nature. The Spiritualist vision, at least in Protestant circles, sprang from a thorough grasp of justification's significance, but now also by a widening appeal to psych^o-social concepts (e.g., personalism) as a metaphysic. The Western Catholic and Protestant orthodoxies both tend to view Incarnation as occasioned by the Fall. Here, however, is where the Spiritualist vision begs to differ, implying that perhaps Incarnation was necessary in any case. By the first view the issues of existence tend to center in man's concerns, such as redemption from alienation, conflict and death. All men seek such salvation. Redemption in Christian terms comes

to mean restoration of a former, righteous relationship with God, which is proven by the Incarnation. To this the Catholic adds that justification inaugurates a deification of man. The Protestant persists by the "faith of assurance" and an imputed original righteousness. (Both views have been attacked recently by Jurgen Moltmann as a misappreciation of the newness - versus originality - of redeemed life.) The Spiritualist understands by the Incarnation to judge from the experience of justification, that God desires to be glorified not by dependency or sin (no felix culpa) but by something deeper, an interior sharing of God's very own existence - holiness. Perfection by grace is external, objective; perfection by holiness adds subjectivity: God, the object of faith, becomes the subject of one's faith. Man's unity with God is realized as God's personal unity is realized - by the indwelling Spirit.

The Spiritualist view says, in short, that theologically, one is not to understand of created nature that in its original issue from God it was in its end state, or that it was above finite. Adam, as the Creator's representative, was (in a Richardson-coined phrase) a mortable, that is, capable of death. A swim in a primordial pond could have ended in drowning, and a pruned branch in the Garden could have struck the first human heads a nasty blow, but these evils would not have affected the relationship of love between God and creation. Creation was conscious of this evil as suffering, a reminder to Adam of his finitude and dependence on providence. Conceivably he could have dealt successfully with whatever anxieties that suffering might stir, and could have transcended them by accepting his finitude. Furthermore, his natural consciousness of God's just love would lead Adam in his

experience of suffering to hopes of vindication, perhaps even resurrection, though it remains just a hope. He could remain in any case in the fullness of confidence in his Creator. Adam was susceptible to still another death, however, brought through an evil that exploits the former, an evil which also disrupts Adam's perfect access to God, an evil which forfeits even the right to hope for a vindication of one's finitude, even if it has involved suffering. Creation falls when it accepts that exploitation. Its kind of death is greatly to be feared. As the Second Adam once commented, the killing of the body is nothing like the killing of the soul; even in Paradise, whatever it was, one may imagine that there was a dream that could be killed.

Christian faith, however, does require a little patience with the Divine point of view, an effort (since all is ex post facto anyway, Fall, Redemption and Incarnation) to imagine just what end was held up to creation as a fulfillment. The great mystery is, of course, that God should create at all. Except to know that the mind of God is gracious, no imagination is equal to contemplation of so vast a deed. Another mystery immediately defies comprehension, namely the condition of "mortality" and its attendant ills: whence evil? I will not even attempt to answer that, or another oft-put question, why suffering? All that can be answered is "Grace". Presumably God's own sense of his just love leads him to the Incarnation. By his commitment to creation he sympathises to the extreme of accepting finitude himself, thereby reinforcing man's natural sense of God's justice, for then surely a vindication is in store. Since, however, man has fallen, he has forfeited that natural commitment from God. The shamoles of the world betray

that constantly, though they also betray the glory that was Adam. Yet because of grace a second mystery comparable to creation takes place: forgiveness, justification. That, paradoxically, has become additionally the occasion of the Incarnation, by which God initiates final action toward the fulfillment of his sympathy with a creation which by grace is once again in an unbroken (and now unbreakable) relation with him: Christ, by his exaltation the first fruit of this dispensation, is our proven hope of that. God's power to fulfill his purpose of glorifying himself becomes the lifting up of his creation into his own existence of holiness. So even this strictly mediatorial view of christology is at base a spiritual view. God the Spirit too is glorified by the exalted humanity of God the Son.

So the redemptive work of God is not what first determines our adoration of him, but only redoubles it. Adoration is owed first of all to Him for his very excellence. It is therefore not surprising to see that redemption is poured out frequently from the hand of God—not surprising in that one now sees this to be consistent with God's graciousness. Grace flows in two waves. Cain, Noah, Abraham, Moses and the children of the exodus all knew various experiences of redemption, and the growing awareness of this eventually blossoms into such renewed hope in justice as to anticipate resurrection. It has been reinforced by the gift of the Covenant, the Law, the prophets, the land. A second wave of grace, however, that which vindicates this imperfect hope of man, surpasses all that could have been expected: Jesus Christ. In this Second Adam and representative of creation, even more than redemption has been wrought. Now the earthen vessel which formerly

could hold the treasure of Divine life only for a season and be adorned by its beauty only because that life stopped to rest therein, is brought to a fiery glaze; the Divine beauty is annealed into the very substance of the vessel itself. It too shines forth with the splendor and glory of God, having his existence besides its own. This satisfies the necessity of glorifying God, that he may be glorious in his saints, that the world may be filled with his glory by the oblations made in the priesthood of Adam. Such beauty and such capacity to glorify are sealed by the Spirit, in addition to manifesting him.

Except to imply that the Incarnation and Redemption have different origins, the foregoing summarized the more traditional views of man's destiny to glorify God and enjoy him forever. What enters with the Spritualist point of view is a dissatisfaction with the prominence given to original sin in theology and piety. This view repudiates the notion of a felix culpa, and the belief that creation's original state was a final one. This does not derogate from the Atonement but underscores its costliness to God and the proof of his love. In recent times perhaps the most awesome statement of this viewpoint is that of Pere Teilhard de Chardin. His statement is memorable because of the cosmic limits to which he pushes contemplation, and because he evokes an interior spiritual sensibility of the material creation that non-Christians or even Christians do not always possess or blend with their scientific knowledge. Teilhard's Cosmic Christ points to the Omega-point as Creation's destiny, when God is all in all. Such a commitment to creation on God's part ("The Lord has sworn and will not repent..") becomes a motivation of man himself to respond by

accelerating the integration of all life since that is what implies and is implied by the complexification of consciousness and the ability of artistic - i.e., technological man - to extend personality. Hence, not the quantity but the quality of complexity must enhance the integration of life as it is driven to merge at the Omega point. That creation remains simuljustus atque peccator is seen when the universe goes "on strike," that is, when it withdraws from integration by preferring the counter-tendency. Yet if the total organism cooperates more fully, then the chain reaction of evil, non-cooperation, in the universe will be diminished and perhaps even isolated, so capable is the spiritual universe of competing with evil. All depends on life in the humanity of God, however, which presupposes a spiritual point of view.

Such a viewpoint, in the hand of some exponents can become what Herbert Richardson condemns as a spiritual racism - "with all its demonic overtones" - by the misconception that the Spirit must "divide mankind into homo sapiens, from whom we descend, and homo progressivus, 'a man for whom the future of this earth counts more than its present.'¹" The Incarnation makes clear that God's personal presence to man is a union of two natures, neither of which is diminished in regards to completeness. The realization of such union must be by the Spirit's indwelling, which protects the moral necessity of creation's salvific communion with Christ by destroying the divisiveness of evil and death. This, however, does no more than to limit the Spirit to maintaining the moral commitment graciously assumed by God in the Incarnation to save man. If God has created to manifest his holiness in space and

accelerating the integration of all life since that is what implies and is implied by the complexification of consciousness and the ability of artistic - i.e., technological man - to extend personality. Hence, not the quantity but the quality of complexity must enhance the integration of life as it is driven to merge at the Omega point. That creation remains simuljustus atque peccator is seen when the universe goes "on strike," that is, when it withdraws from integration by preferring the counter-tendency. Yet if the total organism cooperates more fully, then the chain reaction of evil, non-cooperation, in the universe will be diminished and perhaps even isolated, so capable is the spiritual universe of competing with evil. All depends on life in the humanity of God, however, which presupposes a spiritual point of view.

Such a viewpoint, in the hand of some exponents can become what Herbert Richardson condemns as a spiritual racism - "with all its demonic overtones" - by the misconception that the Spirit must "divide mankind into homo sapiens, from whom we descend, and homo progressivus, 'a man for whom the future of this earth counts more than its present.'¹" The Incarnation makes clear that God's personal presence to man is a union of two natures, neither of which is diminished in regards to completeness. The realization of such union must be by the Spirit's indwelling, which protects the moral necessity of creation's salvific communion with Christ by destroying the divisiveness of evil and death. This, however, does no more than to limit the Spirit to maintaining the moral commitment graciously assumed by God in the Incarnation to save man. If God has created to manifest his holiness in space and

and time, which end is met by the institution of the Sabbath (which in the Christian dispensation spills over into an "eighth day"), then there must be more than a soteriological office of the Spirit (i.e., pertaining to more than only what precedes the Sabbath in creation);

Just as the chief reason for the presence of God with us is not what He can do for us, but for its own sake, so the chief reason for the presence of God in us is not what He can do for us, but for its own sake...The moral work of the Holy Spirit is to maintain our communion with Christ, but the 'religious' work of the Spirit is simply to be the Holy One dwelling in us. This...fulfills the chief end of God in creating the world, viz., to sanctify all things by His personal presence. ²

Since holiness is of the order of existence and not an essence (St. Paul distinguishes between the body, the thing, the essence, as the temple of the Holy Spirit, and holiness, which is brought by the indwelling union) it reveals God's dignity, such a dignity as man does not have, but for which by grace and indwelling, he is made apt. The question Cūr Deus Hōmō? should be linked not so much to Atonement as to another question: Cūr Creatio?

Richardson's view is especially Spiritualist, as we have seen earlier, and while it does not carry the force of inspiration of Teilhard's vision, there is a perception of God as something besides saving power, as I have tried to demonstrate exegetically of the New Testament spirituality. As we have seen earlier, Richardson does have a societal vision of spirituality in present life which may be said not^{to} emerge clearly in a Teilhard-like point of view. In my own terms I have elaborated this as the ethical thrust of holiness which is so clearly recognized in the ascetical interests of Christianity, an asceticism which neither disdains nor worships what is created but rather sees its dignity to consist

in spiritual aptness. This is because of the love of God, and Christian spirituality thus becomes an enterprise of love.

Fr. Richard Mieux Benson, founder of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, at a stage earlier than either Teilhard or Richardson expounded the Incarnation from a Spiritualist bias in terms to which I am quite indebted. In a treatise³ published at the end of his life and his stay in the United States, he worked out a theology of the Virgin Birth which had as its uniting principle the election of creation. It carefully considers many traditional arguments, but refutes all those which like traduc-tionism lead to severe emphasis on original sin as the determinant occasion of the Incarnation, and the growth of overprotective and distracting doctrines like the Immaculate Conception (for which refutation he goes straight to St. Bernard). He refutes Aquinas' opinion on the non-necessity of the Incarnation apart from the fall in a procession remarkably like Richardson's:

We are not to think that when God created all things out of nothing, He created them for the sake of that nothingness out of which they came. God can only have one true end of all He does, and that end is His own glory...What God made was to be worthy of God the Maker, and therefore the finite creature was to be raised out of the indefiniteness of created intelligence to the infinity of Divine glory.⁴

Creation is worthy because it was created not by any demiurge but by God himself, and so even in the vanity of Sin creation exists under a glorious hope. Nevertheless, without the fall, creation still could not glorify God since

No perfection inherent in the creature would be worthy of the infinite glory of the Creator for even if upheld forever it would in itself be finite. The creature would be unworthy of God, unless He, the Creator, should clothe Himself therewith, taking it into the glory of His own Personal life.⁵

the "incommunicableness of the Divine glory inherent in His Person" is graciously shared with created nature in the Incarnation.

If Adam wore clothes to hide his shame, God glorifies and clothes Himself with the nature of man and creation; "with countless multitudes of saints...gathered into vital union with Himself". This new, permanent union surpasses the condition of Adam, who from the outset suffered from the feebleness of a still unexalted free will, as implied by the Fall. Enfeebled as it was in failure, that free will remained to be the "instrument of triumph", since in retaining the image of God man showed "a latent capacity of receiving the Personal indwelling of God". Thus God's creation did not fail and he restored it permissively, simply because he had the power "which should set the evil right". The truth is other:

St. Thomas quotes St. Paul saying that where sin abounded, grace did much more abound...as if the greater glory of redeemed humanity were only to be considered as a remedy making manifest the resources of the Divine beneficence to triumph over the evil which had happened. But the words of the Apostle are more manifestly justified if we recognize the greater glory of redeemed humanity as the triumphant outcome of a previous pre-destination, not merely as the remedial resource of a bewildered Omnipotence.⁶

Fr. Benson's urgent sense of human solidarity, and created nature's need to realize once and for all its haphazard ability to transcend itself leads him to end a mystery-adumbrated essay on the Virgin Birth with a strong plea for mission to every race of mankind. Here again is the ethical vision of holiness, a Spirituality of life in God as he lives in man. That such a vision belonged to one who restored a monastic asceticism of excellent strength to Protestant Christianity ought not to be lost from view.

NOTES TO
POSTSCRIPT TO CHAPTER II

1. Richardson, Toward An American Theology, (cit cap II, supra), p. 154-155.
2. Ibid, p. 153-154.
3. R.M. Benson, "The Virgin Birth of Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Foundation of the Christian Religion", reprint from the Church Eclectic, Ithica, N.Y., ca. 1908
4. Ibid, p. 25.
5. Ibid, p. 27. He goes on to say, "As it was an act of Divine Power to call forth created existence out of the womb of nothingness, so it an act of Divine Power to raise man to the fellowship of the Throne of God. The last step corresponds in dignity with the primary conception. Creation is not left to glitter as a toy in the Divine Presence, produced by an infinite power which may regulate it but cannot turn it to any worthy use. In clothing Himself with the Created from God assumes the creature into the partnership of His own action to be the instrument of His Divine purposes. The Heavenly Jerusalem, the Body of Christ, 'built for the inhabitation of God by the Spirit' (Eph. 2-22) shines forth with all 'the glory of God'. (Rev. XXI:11)
6. Ibid, p. 27-28

CHAPTER III

I. Enough has been said about the background of a theology of the Holy Spirit and of spirituality to warrant a venture into giving it a shape for contemporary use. In the first chapter I have tried to suggest that spirituality poses a theoretical problem of historical and religious significance. In the second chapter the purpose was to do ground work of an exegetical and theological sort to recognize the Holy Spirit, combined with brief survey of some of the theological and ascetical applications of the findings in ancient and modern history. The picture that appears, of course, is uneven, suggestive of something which is massively latent but on the verge of becoming more imposing, more dominant. It is the task of modern spirituality to contemplate and visibly realize so far as possible what is still unseen. That is to attend to the work of the Spirit both actively and passively.

A. When he responds to God's will, the first thing one may say about life in the Spirit is that it means to lift life into correspondence with what is perceived as the will of God, and thus glorifying Him. In responding to God's will, the Christian responds to love, for love pervades every dimension of the Father's intentions. Because love is so all-encompassing a reality

of the inner life of the Godhead, it also spills over into his purpose to glorify himself; all that he does is according to his dignity, his glory, his holiness. There is not much else that can be said except that human-kind experiences the working out of God's loving purpose as created life. Everything about existence can anticipate a destiny - God's glorification. For, "We know that in everything God works for good with those who love him, who are called according to his purpose."¹

3. The exaltation of Christ is the first-fruits of God's salvation of creation, and Christ in glory becomes the rally of hope for those who remain. The second thing to be said of spirituality, therefore, is that it must be a continuation of Christ's work in the world. For this also the Holy Spirit is sent into the world; he unites those who choose the way of the Cross in order to glorify God. Since the Spirit is sent to renew the face of the earth and shed abroad the light of God in men's hearts, the same light illumines and intensifies men's hopes to be vindicated by deliverance from the misery afflicting the great majority of the world's population. It is an entrenched misery which is perpetuated by the existence of evil in high places as well as by cooperation with evil through act or omission in the lower places of every society. The sins of dead fathers weigh on contemporary sons, and repeated acts of malevolence of every kind - usurped power, violence and greed - give evil a new lease on life by stifling hope and crushing dignity. To continue Christ's work is to rely on the Spirit's own gift of the discernment of spirits, to keep alive a vision of spiritual dignity as the clue to existence, to

be inspired with a horror of evil, and to receive courage to accept suffering which is the result both of one's strivings in the Spirit, and which arises from confrontations with evil.

C. An essay in spirituality, moreover, has to be particular. When speaking of spirituality, I have the life of America in mind. The Southern Christian Leadership Conference, while disciplined and guided by nothing short of a sense of "cosmic companionship", has as its motto, "To redeem the soul of America". A most particular incident can unleash a revolution of uncertain beginnings in Montgomery, Alabama that evolves rapidly into a confrontation of forces espousing or opposing an uncritical continuation of "business as usual" in a society fraught with every conceivable ill. The peculiarity of modern life is the unparalleled inter-communication of global occurrences that is revelatory of man's material inter-dependence if of nothing else. This network rapidly generalizes particular happenings.

The break-down of material and political privilege, however, shows white, Western society pitted against the usually non-white, non-Western nations, among whom the majority and fastest-increasing populations live. American technology plays a crucial role in this polarity as any half-interested social critic will admit. Technology provides the means of instantaneous reporting of war in Asia that is waged with cool, technological efficiency and aimed at destroying a millenium's cultural achievement in order to "save" it. The same technology lays highways through trouble-infested cities over which medical "technocrats" can travel on the way to perfecting an antiseptic environment for an

astronautical aristocracy which soars beyond the cities and the planet. Institutional racism continues to disenfranchise the descendants of African slaves, American Indians and Spanish-American peasantry, and dictates against their gaining the technological adroitness by which they could benefit. For as McLuhan, Ong, Teilhard, and countless others have shown, the products of technology can stand for the enhancement of personality by extending its capacities and by improving the conditions of living. The danger of technology is that once veering from such application, it becomes a wasteful, useless multiplication of forces that then work ruthlessly against spiritual dignity.

- D. We are enfeebled by centuries of civilization. Culture, while it refines and educates and gives breadth of vision, sometimes tends to dissipate moral force and energy and leads to shallowness of soul. We live a less vigorous life over a larger area of living. Every invention which multiplies our powers dissipates our force. Every contrivance which increases comfort diminishes the courage to endure. The ceaseless effort to extend our personality without restraint, the extension of vision by the telescope and microscope, the shell which enables us to strike our enemy ten miles away, the power to convey our silliest thought all round the world on desecrated waves of ether, and to multiply these thoughts by millions through the press, all these extensions of life at the circumference seem tending to weaken the springs of character at the center. And just as the hermit standing by his solitary cell might fail to understand the ideal of a motormaniac ever striving to whirl a little faster along the road which leads to nowhere, so we, exhausted by that overstimulation impersonal and social life which is surely destroying our civilization find it hard to do justice to the hermit.²

1. Once again, the hermit monk, that forgotten Third World entity, raises his protest against the assault of evil on dignity, if only assault by lack of sobriety and vigilance: evil of man's own making through the surrender or perversion of dignity. These quaint but prophetic phrasings of an early twentieth-century

monk point to the real issue of the modern struggle for dignity in the non-white or non-Western world: to realize the definition of freedom given long ago by Cicero, "participation in power". The direction of the modern battle reverses the meanings of Fr. Bull in contrasting power and force. Today one would say that multiplied force tends to dissipate power. These two words in the context of the fight for civil rights, and for enfranchisement of the socially excluded, are hardly synonymous. Force is better understood as a physical reality, like strength, and energy, lending itself to metaphorical senses like coercion, or assertion. It is something which has its place in created existence; a physical universe is unimaginable without it. Occuring as force does in creation, it too may be made to glorify God so long as it enhances dignity, having a basic goodness in God's sight. Power has to do with ability and is more appropriate to the higher levels of conscious existence, especially the personal. In King's definitions power is variously "the right use of strength", "the ability to achieve purpose", or "at its best, love implementing the demands of justice".³ Understandably the extensions of these meanings make it possible to relate force and power, but basically their function in the present social struggle requires the distinctions. One more likely empowers or enables someone, and enforces something, than the reverse. Power also is an indispensable aspect of existence.

Such an understanding of power and force reminds one of how positively they are valued by those who wage wars of love against evil, hoping to overcome it with good by force of truth

or soul. Power and force are always viewed positively by the exploited members of society as well. Modern spirituality is obligated to explore the significance of power and force, knowing that the spiritual aim is to glorify God, to whom belong the Kingdom, the Power and the Glory. The ethic of spirituality prefers a metaphysical interpretation of these phenomena by which they are assigned a place in the scale of dignity, or worth. In themselves, they are basically good and not morally neutral. Powers of evil, which perhaps in the modern setting might best be understood as forces of evil, signify in any case the perversion of something good. This perversion doubles the monstrosity of any evil act but does not overthrow the inherent goodness of power. To avoid the contradictory situation of wrongly using the good, the Christian is pledged to seek an order where the purposes of love only are satisfied. In his own life, they are made part of his spiritual oblation and his obedience to Christ.

The socially oppressed are those who are deprived power, who find themselves with little or no controls over their development towards autonomy. This, of course, entails having freedom and equality of access to the components of human existence, whether material, economic, or political, according to the dictates of justice. As we have seen before, such requirements are increasingly understood in terms of a "philosophy" and "metaphysic" derived from the work of social scientists who interpret traditional cultural values in a new light, dealing with the whole physical, psychological, and social reality that

man is. This is a new New Philosophy that accompanies a new Industrial Revolution; the Hobbes, Lockes and Williams give way to the social scientist. The task of modern spirituality is to adopt those parts of this new trend that enhance spiritual being, and also to give, or better, to live signs whose value is to inform the soul of this philosophy as its influence takes even deeper root in the soul of society. It is this philosophy, for instance, that must govern the future use of technology, to keep it from interfering with people's autonomous growth.

2. New and old signs are already in conflict. Racism in America has meant an exercise of power with no regard for its inner-connection with justice and dignity. This has always resulted in injustice and has exacerbated old injuries. The materialistic bent of capitalism has led this society into crimes of exploitation or collusion with exploitation. Twelve million Americans, a disproportionate number of whom are non-white, go without adequate nutrition, housing, education, political representation, and job opportunity, while an even greater number are affected in some way by lack of equality through hostile discrimination in education, work, and so on. Outside the United States this problem, like population, skyrockets, for unlike the developed world (including in this instance China and Cuba), with its poor minority, the majority of inhabitants are in a condition of poverty, and have no free access to the needs of their total welfare. Land distribution, nutrition and housing, alongside education, are the typical problems. Such areas are also underdeveloped in that they are similarly unable to satisfy

created needs, so that social structures are weakened and undermined.

While various national governments have responsibilities of their own in meeting these issues, all of them, especially the most responsible, find themselves constrained by the imbalanced power of developed nations over the internal welfare of others. The United States with one sixteenth of the world's population yearly consumes fifty percent of its natural resources, whether Venezuelan oil reserves or West Indian Bauxite. Conflict arises when the disenfranchised request power that is duly theirs only to be met by force, whether colonialist or neo-colonialist. They desire a revolution, a turning about, of government and economy, of welfare and freedom. The Old signs declare material affluence, and the exercise of power without respecting justice; they condition men with excessive, artificial needs. When the disenfranchised seek power according to the New signs, their motives are mis-perceived by those who have usurped the balance of power and thus find its retention imperiled by the demands of justice. Of course, many revolutionaries seek a mere reversal of power according to the old signs, which because it necessarily cannot be shared in equity, only serves to perpetuate past injustices and falls into the control of those bodies which have unjustly concentrated power to their own use, or else provokes more revolutionary force. Perhaps vengeance also enters the picture as old wounds are spitefully nursed. (This is why in America there is conflict between violent and non-violent revolutionaries, for they differ in opinion about the use of violent force to secure power. Non-violence considers such a

tactic self-defeating.) Meantime, the disenfranchised have very little of their existence over which to retain power, and that little includes sexual intimacy and the ability to raise families, even when they cannot be supported adequately.

The old signs of power and affluence obstruct the new signs of power rightly understood, and of adequate welfare. While the latter signs have not been uniformly defined, they already have a general shape which can claim unanimity: opposition to Western values, and a search for native ones by which to enhance dignity. For the truth is, as Denis Goulet points out, that "Affluence for the masses is impossible except on terms demeaning to Third World societies themselves."⁴ Nevertheless there are attitudes within the American power-structure, even on the part of those who recognize the injustices of American racism and materialism, by which the self-interest and violence (direct or institutional-whatever undermines dignity) of this society are projected onto the dispossessed. These attitudes are visible in the population debate. The finite and rapidly decreasing supply of natural resources and booming population are weighed with this age's responsibility to coming generations in mind. For the obvious, impending crisis of supply and demand, palliative solutions of imposed birth control, sterility or abortion measures are proposed. They are palliatives because they make the already disenfranchised look like the criminal for having too many children or ^{for} being undereducated (and therefore guilty of not contributing to society). They presuppose affluent levels of demand.

3. Here is a case for the sympathy of Christian spirituality. Simply to impose such solutions unilaterally with no compensating move to reverse existing injustices is an unacceptable choice, which needs a justification bordering on idolatry. It is to remove every last trace of power within the masses and to slash at their last dignity. Such programs begin well enough, recognizing the need for an austere use of natural resources, but end up by making the poor act out the guilt and anxieties of the rich, who in America consume and pollute natural resources disproportionately. These solutions are made at a time when all alternatives are anything but completely explored, when racism and materialism still rouse sufficient anxiety as to make the unjustly powerful and rich assert themselves further, even to fascism. Justice must be the wall built between such ingrained trends and immediate solution. Still, of course, the future must be faced responsibly; of course, the disenfranchised must be educated in the use and development of technology; and, of course, population must grow reasonably; but also, problems must be seen in perspective.

Over-concern about survival tomorrow can make today's injustices more monstrous; the future has its claims but so also do the past and present. The day's evils are sufficient, and the real problem must be addressed. As Goulet also points out,

It is time for the rich world to tamper with its own desire mechanisms, this time to moderate acquisitive desires, not to arouse them if it expects others to practice restraint.⁵ (emphasis added)

Power is ultimately a spiritual reality, love implementing the demands of justice in order that God may be glorified in all things. It is spiritual sensibilities which make the Gandhi's,

King's Nyerere"s, and other leaders from the Third World resist the abuses against dignity which over-developed societies now perpetrate as if by second-nature. In the company of an Illič or Goulet, or a Barbara Ward, they research native symbols of society, change, education and development which do not pre-suppose affluence, violence or the misuse of power. The poor may be coerced into subsistent living, but that only makes them aware of the more basic issued of dignity, whose denial is more of an affront than present sufferings, horrible as these are. As we have seen, the poor have more of a stake in apocalyptic concerns, demanding "Freedom now! Justice ncw!" and allowing no further deferral of dreams. If there is such hope, on which revolutions thrive (despair reduces them to revolts), then a little more crowding, still more hungering and dying can be endured. Within oppressed communities the threshold of pain, unlike the rich man's, is high, (but not unlimited). The Third World sees a great light from darkness, shouting "Let dignity be addressed first of all", and marshall\$ its hopes accordingly. The Christian must recognize this as the Spirit's assertion of himself, a providential stirring of what is basic reality in created existence: the spiritual. He broods over the birth of truth and freedom everywhere.

Dignity constitutes what is at once a most elemental and mysterious dimension of existence. It exposes the evil of evil, and gives meaning to other existential values like freedom and justice; all these values are in fact inseparable. Where dignity is destroyed, justice is not in effect, nor does freedom exist. Given justice and mercy, dignity can be restored. The poor may

have a right moral cause, but if they lack power, they are reduced to what King describes as powerless morality. Immoral power, obviously, characterizes the usurpations of an un-yielding majority. The disenfranchised, by virtue of their position, recognize the indispensability of power, although very easily they too can be drawn into a vengeful craving for power as it is unjustly exercised. Typically, the revolutionary leaders of the poor often genuinely hope to turn fortunes about so as to have a chance to be successful where the rich and powerful have failed in the past. This hope is branded arrogant or naive by the opponents of justice or by impassive by-standers, but as we saw of King, and as one sees of many Third World leaders, such an expectation is a persistent theme in every revolution. The rise of strategic uses of non-violence in this century has, one could say, even legitimated that hope, for it has won some important battles at very low cost for all concerned. The worst battles, however, have yet to come during an unpredictable future, and so the hope remains a hope. The primacy of freedom and power imposes itself on the attention of Christian spirituality, The Christian must act and strive to have the world act in remembrance that power belongs to God, who alone is worthy to receive all honor, glory, power and dominion. His omnipotence means retaining the ability to achieve whatever purposes he sets before himself out of love, and the human use of power must be oriented in accordance with that order.

For Christian spirituality to espouse power turns out to have signal importance for both the world and the Church.

The purely natural understanding needs to be spiritualized as well. In piety the Spiritualist stance is better suited than the Incarnationalist for the sake of elaborating this truth about power because of what is clarified about eschatology by a high devotion to the Holy Spirit. The Church is stressed as an indwelt Temple, a future Bride of Christ at the Heavenly Banquet and not an unchanging, realized actuality. The Spirit is present in the Incarnation not just to give power but also to make perfect the union of the eternal with the create¹, the presence of the Holy One of Israel in the person of Christ; and to do not just a moral act of guaranteeing redemption but also to fulfill the religious possibility of worship by an indwelling and unitive anointing. This is to remember that the role of Messiah is first of all a prophetic one, as in Jeremiah and Deutero-Isaiah, although distinctly new or "Christian" in the New Testament message. To view the Incarnation's place in eschatology with a view only to power is to persist in the naturalistic understanding. Viewed according to worship and the glorification of God in man the Incarnation turns our interest beyond the natural. Both Prophet and Messiah have cultic connections; after three days, a new Temple is raised up. When by spirituality the Christian recipi² tulates this pattern, he finds himself also a prophet with cultic obligations.

Finally, we remember what has been said exegetically and historically and must be said theologically: prophecy has an inner-connection with poverty and other asceticism of a unique rigueur. Such asceticism by worldly standards is comprised of

signs of weakness, but in the prophetic view the same is also a spiritual sign. Spirituality, that is, is unnatural in that it is always required to conform to what also goes beyond the natural. Furthermore, in America ^{/today} poverty so regarded ought to be the over-arching theme of spirituality because of what is taught of detachment and austerity. From such a spirituality are born the signs which must guide the Christian and ultimately the world. Spiritual Poverty, one must see, is nothing other than our particular beginning for this schema of spirituality revealed from the other side, namely power. "My grace is sufficient for you, for my power is made perfect in weakness".⁶

II. A. The first revolution in the Christian's life is repentance from sin as the way of receiving God's forgiveness. What this requires is an unflinching ability to be repulsed by the ugliness of a selfish existence, to be purged by the wiping away of delusions about one's pretensions and ^{about} the reality that explains most of his failures. If a man is seized by a true vision of compassion, then he will be able to feel ^{sorrow} for his own offenses against love the sorrow which is the mark of repentance. The shock of sorrow also leads to a sense of unworthiness of those lovers and loved ones, the true guilt experienced as inferiority, at the same time that there stirs a longing to be accepted by those who are worthy, that the pain of unworthiness may be lifted. Jesus Christ is alone he who can evoke so powerful a sense of unworthiness in any man and yet demand the worship that is implied in the longing for acceptance.

We, who are unworthy to be called his Father's sons, or to have Christ himself enter our shambles of a life, nevertheless find ourselves mysteriously addressed by him with a claim on a place in our existence. His cross is a proof of our guilt and his claim. The biblical language about the demons who cry out in protest against Christ as he casts them out describes perfectly our cowardice to suffer the piercing cut of reprimanding but also forgiving love that his encounter brings. Birth, a debut into human society and solidarity and a universe where anxiety is almost instinctual, implicates us in a condition basically hostile toward God's love and existence. He has no quarrel with us, but he takes the first step anyway, melting our hardness of heart with the warmth of his love by the Spirit, removing us from the cold north of turmoil to the warm tropic of his compassion. While we still lapse into the ways of the old existence, we are nonetheless clothed with a new one, God's own holy existence, and given the sure promise of citizenship in his homeland. Its vision is quickened by faith, the confidence and perseverance in God's call to us. By repentance and conversion of life to life in the Spirit, we are made the friends and brothers of the Son who rules in the full glory of the Father, not vassals, but citizens in his kingdom by a spiritual and not a material inheritance. To repeat sin is to fail to accept the dignity he bestows on us.

There is but one thing to do with so much love: to share it, and to share it in the fashion of the Lord. His love was a searching compassion, motivated by a profound sense of justice *for* the outcast, the oppressed, the imprisoned, the poor. His very

existence was and is good news to them, and they are honored by his rescuing their status so as to make it a defining of human and spiritual dignity. He who is poor has the least possibility of masking his existence with deceiving, ambitious pretensions; he is best prepared to hear the truth about himself, and to appreciate the uplift of hope and joy. The rich and powerful have nothing like so great a headstart toward moral transparency, because they are encumbered by the properties of their existence, and gnawed at by the fetters of guilt and anxiety over what is too frequently a precarious, unjustly founded structure of existence. The poor man is also the readiest, if he do respond, to leave one existence for another, his for Christ's, at his Lord's call. He will answer morally, returning great love to God by acts of love and mercy, but he likewise responds religiously in such acts, which is the spontaneous dimension that mercy and joy adds to love with a strength greater than that of discouragement and hardship to destroy or quench such worshipful love. Traditional American and Western religiosity has abdicated the fulfillment of the exact meanings of love.

Vocation is the theological name of God's call to creation to join in his own existence. In calling creation to a destiny, he forgives, or justifies it out of sheer grace, and thus promises it a vindication. What is justified by God neither needs nor can have another justification. Man's impulse is to justify himself and his existence in the full sense of the word as commonly used: to rationalize, to find his own reasons for existence. The Christian knows otherwise, or ought to, although without confession he can reach the idolatrous extreme of identifying

his and God's justifications. God's forgiveness aims at giving man the righteousness to share in the existence of holiness, which aim was achieved by Christ's sacrifice and exaltation. He would have man see and enjoy the basic rightness and goodness that creation was meant to have, as he would also have man see the sheer desirability of being destined to eternity. As one comprehends that truth, he realizes that vocation works particularly. While man must diminish as Christ increases, created nature itself is called upon to glorify the Father, so that it is obligated to take itself no more or less seriously than he has. A man must be himself.

When one awakens to the dignity which God intends him to have, something profound happens. The rise of black awareness in America has no other explanation. Black America is presently engaged in an irreversible ascent to self-fulfillment, an ascent which is crowded by all the mortal dangers of error and self-delusion that prevents one's mind from being as Christ's mind, but it is an ascent as surely ordained of God as any other event of history. What failed in the frustrated slave rebellions, in the deceptions of emancipation, and has failed in the slow deliverance of old promises, is now pursued with a vigor that allows no looking back. It is the battle to reclaim usurped power and thereby live a dignified life. The black struggle seen in its spiritual merits implies an utter dependence on the promises of Christ. "The first shall be last and the last shall be first", is a promise received on faith, and the Christian should be most sensitive to this.

For the same reason King and other non-violent leaders have constantly had to submit their efforts to a spiritual vision, preparing themselves, as in King's instance, even for sacrifice. The non-violent shun preoccupation with vengeance (which belongs to God) because of the temptation to idolatry, the same idolatry which stigmatized racialism, but they, no less than the militant who is defensively prepared to mete out violence, know that prolonged injustice only leads to judgement, some of which, like the Kingdom, infringes on the present order. Non-violence seeks a moral excellence which is made sin for the sake of the sinful, in order that evil as violence may not be extended into the next saeculum. "I am somebody!" cries the new black man, and that is the stuff of response to vocation. It is further imperative to see the resistance of blacks to the American distortion of democracy as a hope for the masses of the world, which by the networks of technology and of military, political and commercial avarice, plus the more basic tie of human solidarity, is inter-related as never before. Non-white, non-Western civilization finds itself in no need to justify its existence to anyone, to be forgiven of what is originally evil in its existence except by God. To the poor and despised has been given in this interim the call to be a light to the nations. In such a situation, it is the Holy Spirit who speaks most directly, and spirituality must work toward the success of his revolution by accepting its cost.

Let us note that vocation is external and objective. It is a common mistake to confuse 'the call' with the 'response'. The call comes from God himself speaking either immediately to the soul..., or Mediatly thru the church, or our friends, or our nation, or the human race. God is brooding over his creation. The universe awakens to self consciousness in man. God reveals himself to man in many ways and thru diverse channels. He unveils himself in the beauty of nature, in the researches of science, in the working of our reason, in the intuitions of our hearts, in the imperative of our conscience and in the long reaches of history. But God is more than thought, more than that passionless abstraction of the philosophers, 'the absolute'. He is energy, a will which is slowly working out its eternal purpose. And he is more than will, he is love and it in love that this purpose is fulfilled. So God communicates himself to man in inspiration, that man may cooperate with him in the great design. There is not only a vision-revelation. There is also a voice-inspiration. 'Wisdom remaining in herself reneweth all things: & from generation to generation passing into holy souls she maketh them friends of God and Prophets'.

III. A. Justification and vocation, we see, leads to a new life of sanctification, in which the perception rules that all created existence is to become one of holiness. Right away one finds that vocation issues in community. For it is the nature of things that community increases efficiency; the combined efficiency of individuals grouped together transcends their isolated capabilities. While this is precisely the governing principle of industrial technology, or the evolution of organisms, it is a principle of metaphysical truth as well. Freedom is participation in power, and power, belonging to God, ought to be justly distributed. The possibilities of transcendence are misapplied by the tyrants or classes which concentrate power for their own sake. The just ruler's maxim is, "United we stand, divided we fall." The despot's shortsightedness overlooks the reaction that immorally used force can provoke. The same self-transcendence occurs in the heart indwelt by the Holy Spirit, who weaves the Christian deep into the communion of saints. Their leaven helps to raise

the whole loaf. Far more than technology increases the possibilities of communication, the Holy Spirit transcends and unites the Church beyond time. Spiritually we may approach and be approached by those who have gone before or succeed us in a communion of saints. The scandal of invoking saints is not the prayer-bidding, for that is done naturally and rightly by saints here on earth; the scandal consists in the most unnatural possibility brought to perfection by the Holy Spirit. Nothing can separate us from the love of Christ.

Our enacted representations of this transcendent life comprise the sacramental life. As Richardson and Berkhof point out, what follows in the creeds after the naming of the Spirit are not separate articles of belief but enumerations of works of the Spirit.⁸ The forgiveness of sins may be experienced in baptism, the first of the two pre-imminent eschatological mysteries, which also bestows the Seal of the Spirit. Forgiveness is also achieved in a life of spiritual sacrifice by which even property (in common) is part of sanctification. Forgiveness is given mutually ("as we forgive those who sin against us") in mutual confession. It is also given by those who have been raised up to remit or retain sins in the name of our great High Priest and Guardian of ourselves. Similar realities of transcendence multiply the number of sacramental signs beyond reckoning. In their totality they constitute the gifts of the Spirit, such as St. Paul lists in ICor. 13f. The Holy and Indwelling Spirit carries out the work of God begun in Christ by building up a spiritual creation on the foundation of which Christ is the chief cornerstone. This, plus the regenerative aspect of baptism, reminds us of the feminine tenderness of the Spirit. The Church which he creates is the Mother of us

all, as seen in the light of the Kingdom. With that in mind we ought to recall the Palestinian spirituality once again, and the Semitic use of the feminine gender for the word "spirit".¹⁰ Women liberationists would be heartened by the notion's suggestiveness, as by the curious fact that the office of deaconess developed farthest in the Nestorian churches. There is another curious echo of this in the enthusiastic ascetical Shaker communities of nineteenth-century America (some still survive), where God was believed to have a feminine person as well as masculine, and where male - female relations were truly egalitarian. Mankind, a spiritually apt creature, was made male and female.

B. The gifts of the Spirit do not come pointlessly. I would find at least three reasons for their bestowal. First, they make possible the enjoyment of God. One tastes and sees how gracious the Lord is, and he beholds what a good thing it is for brothers to dwell in unity. The Spirit fills the Church's heart with all peace, and joy,^{and} utterances too deep for words, and one receives the Spirit as the pledge of the life which is to come. The same gifts are evidence and reassurance of God's active presence in the world. Second and thirdly, the gifts, the charismata, are conferred as signs and means of edification and authority. The charismatic figure is not spiritually gifted for his own sake but for the community's sake, who are built up by the sharing and exercising of his gifts, and trained in the obedience of discipleship by submission to the spiritual leader.

To receive obedience is the privilege of authority, though this authority remains an earthen vessel. The generally high level of spiritual gifts to the Church, however, does not permit

any sterile regimentation of authority. Christians encourage each other, and they submit themselves to one another, as well as to the apostolic authorities; husbands and wives submit to each other, and all things are subject to Christ. The Charismata are given for edification, furthermore, because God is building a Kingdom, a heavenly city, of which he is also the keeper. The Church is a neighborhood of that Kingdom and needs vigilance, for which apostles are sent, but also teachers, prophets, healers, and so on. Some gifts are singular, like the Twelve, the canon, the Theotokes, and some are more general, like the clergy, while the whole is built up in great anonymous quantity (from a human perspective) into a spiritual Temple. Everyone is a priest in that Temple, in whose structure, as at its foundation of apostles and prophets, and in its general frame (the clergy of bishops, presbyters and deacons) specific functions and roles are "raised up". The Church is ^{it} a Body, which means growth and a kind of autonomy. Whereas not all the organs can be identical, there is diversification within a structure which because of the common life in all its parts theoretically prevents the specializations from hardening past more adaptation.

C. Charismata may be seen from another point of view where the Kingdom is concerned. The people of God are a people of a Covenant. The latter might be considered as the concretization of God's call to his people, who by entering into the Covenant are bound to certain observances, for it has the nature of a political accord between a sovereign and a nation which he has conquered for himself. Israel as a people of the Law honored but one Lord in the Palestinian pantheon. Modern Old Testament

studies have taken a great leap forward with some important discoveries affecting the interpretation of the Covenant, which for the longest time was looked upon mainly as a corpus of legalism whose casuistic fetters were broken by the New Covenant of grace. The first discovery was that not all of the Old Testament may be classified as casuistic, but rather, must be seen as apodictic. The Decalogue (of Exodus) was the apodictic exception of the general casuistic rule, for the form of its commandments, not negatively, has the effect of making a statement of principle, inasmuch as but a single offense is prohibited: "Thou shalt not..". Casuistry, on the other hand, necessarily bogs down in multiple statements because it tries to proscribe by affirmative commands what soon turns into an infinity of rules. The former have theological import, the second kind do not.

The second discovery was the unearthing of assorted Ancient Near Eastern documents that included Hittite suzerainty treaties. Very quickly it was recognized how these extremely ancient documents, which could date from the time of the conquest of Palestine, resembled the kind of covenant that Yahweh made with the Hebrews at Sinai. In the declaration of Covenant, the sovereign named himself and his stipulation^s; invoked the witness of surrounding super-natural forces over the newly recorded laws; threatened curses on those who broke the commandment; and provided for a periodical, cultic rehearsal of the whole document on the part of the new subjects. This has clear Old Testament parallels. The general shape is preserved in Exod. 20:1ff, the Sinai experience, and at Jos. 24:25-27, which recapitulates the ceremony in perfect

detail, and Deut. 27:16 ff. supplies the missing curses. This discovery reverses a major opinion about Israelite laws, for it shows how the Hebrew theologians utterly demythologised Canaanite mythologies by enthroning Yaweh as king above all Gods (vis. Ps. 29). History replaced mythology. If this is so, then it requires treating the Covenant tradition as something revolutionary from its beginnings, with an integrity of its own, and consistent with the later prophetic spirit. This counters the view that the conquest was successful only as Israel assimilated and sifted Canaanite legal codes, of which such documents as the (casuistic) code of Hammurabi were once the only known parallels. This, of course, also demands theology's taking seriously the history of Israel and her nearly divinizing devotion to the Word of the Lord.¹¹

The history of Israel, the am^Wctionic league which owed allegiance only to Yahweh, the Lord of all existence, and which evolved into the kingdom of David, the monarch who was seated over Israel in the name of his Lord, has relevance for the New Israel's history. Both have continued to replace monarchs and emperors with the true King; and mythology with history, for the bond of redemption and election, of worship and obedience, is seen in all its complexity as a reality that is ever-expanding, and more inclusive, but always unique. Israel erred in becoming only an ethnic and political body, for that was not her office, as the prophets continually had to drive home. As Deuteronomy proclaims, the relationship is entirely one of grace, and Yahweh's demands are peculiarly rigorous (Deut 7:6ff). That message was continually submerged through hardness of heart and disloyalty on Israel's part, though not Yahweh's. The Church, the New Israel

in which there is neither Jew nor Greek, has similarly evolved from a germinal simplicity to a more complex reality constantly in need of renewal, and is established as a covenant people. The New Israel's cult is the Holy Eucharist, by which the Covenant's eternal contemporaneity is renewed. Not a Law received by Moses but Christ himself is celebrated and given, who by action of the Spirit, is celebrant. The significance of the institution of either covenant, however, is not for their contrast, but for the similarity of how the institutional or official is given an inner-connection with the charismatic. For while Christ is his own priest, he nevertheless uses a priesthood to re-enact his Covenant as a matter of course to lead in this act of obedience. Such an inner-connection relaxes the tension between Law and Grace, as we have seen in another context.

This can be demonstrated in the case of prophetism. At one point, prophetism, like the Covenant, was regarded as a Canaanite original that was assimilated and adapted as an Israelite copy; the sons of the prophets were but a slight revision of raving of the prophets of Baal. None of them, not even Elijah, was esteemed anything like the succeeding "writing-prophets" of the Northern and Southern Kingdoms. So impressive were the latter that it was speculated that the apodictic portions of the Covenant, and perhaps Deuteronomy's parenetic qualities, must have gotten there at a late stage-in the wake of the prophets. This too has all been reversed. The studies in Covenant, the better appreciation of Deuteronomy's antiquity, and the revolution of prophetic studies since the publication of Mowinckel's Psalmenstudien would

seem to pose quite a different question. Mowinckel's study in the liturgical use of the Psalms in Israel hastened the insight that the so-called prophetic psalms (e.g., ps. 85) prove that prophets indeed had cultic connections (the call of Amos-7:14 is in the midst of the controversy). The prophetic condemnation of solemn assemblies and fasts was put in perspective. Then it was discovered that just as prophets functioned in a priestly fashion in leading certain kinds of sacrificial offerings, priests and levites had quite prophetic capacities in serving as oracles of the Word of Yahweh.¹² The question arises, then, of origins, not of the Covenant in the prophets, but of the latter in the covenant. Does not the command to celebrate it in congregational worship imply a necessity of ministerial mediation?

The promise in Deut. 18:15 of a prophet who will be raised up is a possible sign of this. One scholar even finds this passage to have an inaugural quality like that of an ordinal or of the Covenant as seen in Exod. 20, and concludes that the prophetic figure is so basic to the covenantal life that "...We can say that there is no evidence of an office completely determined by the charismatic gift."¹³ One should also think of Moses, therefore, as he leads Israel at Sinai in the Covenant's institution, looking first like a prophet (as he does in the book of Numbers when he and the seventy elders prophesy), then, like a priest, (when proceeding to perform ceremonial ablutions), only to lead the people off into the wilderness like an amphyctionic judge (viz. Exod. 24:8ff). Perhaps the only way to do justice to Israel's profound reverence for the prophetic office and figure, which is

matched only by her awe for the Covenant, is to see that they exist by a theological necessity. It does not occur to any Israelite to question that their nation has always been graced with prophets from the very days of Sinai; all the evidence is to the opposite (viz., Jeremiah's assumption, Jer. 7:25). It is as if the Covenant generated their office. The frequently ecstatic office of judge in the age of the conquest evolves to the figure of Smauel, who thus becomes a kind of amphibian between primordial water and prophetic ground. What a prophet was in 597 B.C. is clear, but not so when one looks beyond 722 B.C., unless he adds to Israel's conviction (formalized in Deuteronomy) some theological underpinning. In any case it is necessary to take some of the romantic non-sense out of overdrawn contrasts between charism and cult, or charism and office; neither makes sense without the other.

I think that this Old Testament evidence is crucial to a formulation by spirituality of phenomena connected with the New Covenant. It certainly becomes difficult to exaggerate the differences of spirituality in the different levels of the New Testament community and canon. It is not that one stage of the Church has a pneumatic life and the next one an objective spirituality, as is so frequently said. The history of Jewish Christianity alone would refute that. The evolution of charismatic authority within the Church passes through natural stages in the evolving life of an organism. Constant inner diversification leads to new realizations of integration and transcendence. Christology shows the multiplicity of roles fulfilled by Christ, and our spirituality must show the same of charismatic graces.

When, therefore, we confront an institution like episcopacy in the Church, we should not be distressed by the obscurity of its origins (the New Testament blend of functions between presbyter and overseer, the hazy passage from apostle to presbyter) because this is a rich confusion which simply has to be. It is the providential work of the Holy Spirit in a Body which has a freedom of developmental possibilities. For the same reason it could be possible to make contemporary changes in the office.

Authoritative charisms are a transfiguration of what is anthropologically basic, the evolution of community government, the employing of skill and genius, but the transfiguration means also that these charisms have an eschatological significance, for they exist to edify a Body which is called of God to lead creation in the Way of its Elder Brother. Once this is realized, then still other institutions make charismatic sense, among which I would rank monasticism. The history of studies in asceticism, as we saw, has itself gone through some drastic reversals. It is no mere acquisition from some Hellenistic Canaan but an integral feature of the New Covenant from its beginnings, though it had to pass through many developments before reaching cenobitic expression and taking root in soils of different aptness.¹⁴ That hardly marks the end of development, however, as the intervening sixteen centuries have shown.

The exegetical and historical integrity of asceticism have a theological counterpart, in that asceticism becomes an eschatological sign of the nature of discipleship. It signifies the detachment that must color the disciple's life, which he must

lose in order to gain Life; he cannot gain the world at the cost of himself. Asceticism also symbolized the austerity of a life which must not take care for the morrow, but enjoy Christ for the day. Monastic asceticism is a facet of vocation under the Covenant, from which it is generated, as it were, and from which it receives its one needed justification. Over-all asceticism is a guarantee of revolutionary life. Asceticism in general is part of Christian Vocation.

IV. A. An ending is now in sight. It remains to see at least a few examples of where ascetical spirituality might be applied in a modern world. Christian Asceticism presupposes an unnatural order of life, which by non-spiritual canons is also a sign of weakness and unpleasant sternness. It seems incompatible with happiness. History, after all, is full of the sterile wreckage of aborted holiness movements, and the white bones of ossified enthusiasm, and is tired of grim revolutionaries who do not know how to laugh. This natural understanding, however, misses the point of spirituality. It is the guarding of an existence other than one's own that is sought. It is to awaken to a surge of solidaristic love for the world in which one lives, but to love it only in a manner which honors its dignity. For that a disciplined detachment must be adhered to, which adherence I would define as spiritual behavior.

A. Detachment is necessary for dealing with the typical problems of our time, beginning with justice for the disenfranchised. That leads, as we have seen, to a consideration of power and poverty. We may also add alienation: of self from self; of man from woman; of man from his environment. Alienation works

like aggression, however, since it takes hold especially where there is selfish assertion. Selfishness crops up out of our discomfort with pain, out of impatience with having to order our lives according to an existence which is not our own, but still broader. We cannot grasp the importance of dignity until we realize how much occurs within our lives that is destructive of our own dignity and that of the world around us. Sin is the name of that destructiveness and only through a striving in the Spirit can it be overcome.

1. Poverty, as detachment, for reasons already declared, must be the beginning point. The American attachment to capital and property is a cankerous defect in the character of our society. The canker is particularly severe because people have been used as property in America through African slavery, a perversion which has been prolonged in racism, almost to the point of hopelessly corrupting the fabric of the whole society. Furthermore, the aggressive exploitation of minority ethnic groups, and the economic exploitation of resources has conditioned Americans to expect that affluent standards of consumption can be maintained indefinitely, and has hardened their hearts to social sharing. To secure such interests a militaristic lust has traded power for force and has exploded nuclear weapons which along with other resources badly used have been turned back into the environment as pollutants. The complex of military and capital interests has oppressive attachments to power which interfere with the political adjustment of raging world and domestic social problems. The pity is that churches have exercised little protest against this pattern.

In answer spiritual poverty would assert that Christ literally meant that attachment to material goods inhibits a man's progress in the life of the Spirit. If one cannot "hang loose" toward private possessions he cannot remain worthy of Christ, and the ethical tendency of holiness is interrupted. There is no such thing as private holiness. The psychology of the acquisitive person allows him no comfort since all his energy becomes protective and defensive with respect to capital gained, and offensively aggressive with respect to maintaining a useless affluence. This avarice in a finite system tends to reinforce an unjust balance of power in the hands of the rich consumers, which aggravates the problems of the poor. Yet it is the poor who today are being turned against in the scramble to solve the problem of growing scarcity, as we saw earlier. The spread of Third World militancy and nationalism is evidence of the non-Western world's willingness to galvanize itself against the anxious and reckless ways of the West, but that is only one side of the approach - the goal of the positive use of force and power. It does accompany, though, a growth of dignity. The rich must give evidence of another kind, the voluntary surrender of what is not theirs, and withdrawal from empires of private capital by foregoing affluence to invest in the enhancement of human dignity. Otherwise the aggressor and the oppressed are locked in conflict.

On the secular plane alone there is the value of a powerful sign in finding voluntary control, or austerity, to organize one's life around. Denis Goulet finds two "compelling human reasons" dictating voluntary austerity on the part of the rich : the gaining of freedom, and the bond of solidarity that would be forged with the poor.

Men must free themselves from slavery to their own desires. Individuals living in societies that goad them to consume relentlessly must assert by their actions the primacy of their personality over things and over forces which powerfully and insistently violate their desires... Unless one has psychologically 'tuned in' on the wavelength of the poor, one cannot imagine what it means to be underdeveloped... Although it must remain free, austerity must be severe enough to awaken the man who practices it to the true dimensions of hardship outside his own world of sufficiency. 15

That is almost all a Christian has to say except that such austerity also has an aesthetic dimension, since detachment also makes it possible to enjoy a thing in itself by dictating against its being taken for granted. Fasting (as opposed to dieting) can do this for food, and given the opportunity to participate in a boycott of California table grapes, one can unite the ethical and aesthetical dimensions of the ascetical sign. Conservation can do this for ecology. Voluntary austerity also helps one to enter more deeply into the human life of Jesus, who with his followers formed a community of goods. In that community there is a chance of communicating spiritually since the detachment from material goods increases the possibility of companionship in depth through the sharing of good and bad fortune. 16 This is true in the married and celibate families and communities. The basic goodness of the material is still appreciated, but it is subordinated to adequate welfare and nothing else.

Finally, the drama of today's social realities evoke two basic Christian values which American society has trampled, that power and property ultimately belong only to God. Neither can be qualified "black, white, American, mine," or whatever, if by the qualification is meant power or property according to the old sign

of forced deprivation, affluence, or usurpation; God must be glorified in all things. As Prior Roger Schutz of Taizé quotes Basil of Caesarea,

Such are the rich. They consider common goods as belonging to them because they got them first... If you call a house your 'own', you have said nothing. In fact the air and the earth and every dwelling place belong to the Creator (just as do you yourselves who have built them) and everything without exception... The community of goods is a more adequate mode of existence than private₁₇ property, and the only one which conforms to nature.

'Nature' in this sense recalls nature according to its predestination in the glorification of God. What the Ebionite knew and practiced, and also the Syrian and Egyptian ascetics, modern America has to grasp or perish. Christ blesses the poor first of all, and promises the Kingdom to them, the Kingdom of a truly dignifying participation in power. Voluntary poverty is a political as well as communal spiritual vision (Communist!), for we have seen the desirability of combined efficiency in matter and in spirit as consecrated by the Holy Spirit. It is an imperative for unity.

2. a. When one begins to treat the more objective parts of his existence with detachment, he discovers that the solidarity he can feel with the poor or anyone else leads to friendship. In this light the virtue of chastity is seen as an exercise in detachment. Chastity seeks a purity of motive as part of the spiritual vision: "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God". In other words purity of heart means truly to be able to see one's brother, (and thus genuinely love the Father whom one has not seen). If white America exercised more detachment

toward property, power, and people, she could recognize the desires of the oppressed sympathetically, allowing them the same autonomy of growth that every white desires for himself. Love is not possessive or self-assertive in its proper dimension. It is the control of basic_{ly} good, erotic drives which out of control only wreak havoc, although this does not imply that loss of control is inevitable. Chastity, therefore, also presupposes self-examination and confession, as well as an acceptance of one's basic impulses such as desire of sexual gratification and anger, two critical aspects of human affectivity.

b. Alienation between the sexes can be overcome only where there is detachment. This is not the same as being unattached of /r disinterested. Instead, detachment requires a love that glories in the other person's freedom, rather than indulging individual libertinism. When Christians marry, they are to aim at a spiritualized detachment by which nothing less than Christ's relation to the Church is symbolized; the sexual bond itself can have spiritual, even eschatological import. For the same reason one might sympathetic love (the mutual submission) prior to procreative love in the sexual function. One of the consequences would be to give legitimacy to birth control practices, even as an ascetical usage between marriage partners, although this would not replace the biblically sanctioned practice of temporary, mutual continence, nor abolish the privilege and duty of raising families. 18 In the face of the current population explosion, this would be a timely insight. Where population control among the dispossessed is concerned, justice, as I have said, must be done first. It seems entirely reasonable to expect, however, that an authentic

move toward distributive justice through voluntary austerity among the affluent, by raising the material level of the poorer masses, would have the persuasive office of lowering birth rates through enlightened self-interest, and, finally, corporate responsibility. Population rates, it should be noted, are slowest in the materially¹ privileged groups and nations, even in the Asian country of Japan.

Marriage is protected by another ascetical measure, however, namely celibacy, which is on equal vocational footing with marriage in spirituality. Vocation has been seen as a gift from God. "The gift of blackness", for instance, is only an existential reality. One can have all the genetic inheritance of natural features, but it is only by appropriation of existence in the family of the universe that one's natural endowments make any sense. The vocation, of course, lies within the economy of what God has predestined; it is finally an eschatological sign. Marriage and celibacy are called gifts by St. Paul, for whom the "gifts and the calling of God are without repentance (i.e.,
¹⁹irrevocable)." Jesus' word, or at least that of canon is that by marriage one must understand that "What God has joined let no man put asunder"; it has an absolute vocational character.

In his own person, and in his demands for radical discipleship, in which one is faced with possible abdication of "house or wife, or brothers or parents or children", Jesus instituted celibacy, an absolute vocational state by which one may become a "eunuch for the sake of the kingdom of heaven". No mutilation is intended by that, but instead the ironic fulfillment and supersession through celibacy of the prophesy in Isa. 56:4-5, just

as the Virgin Birth is the ironic fulfillment of Isa. 7:14. Whereas previously the Law spoke of physical descent from Abraham, circumcision, and marriage by which one increased the numbers of the children of Israel and secured his portion in the promises of the covenant, now the spiritual circumcision of the heart at baptism become the eschatological signs of entry into the kingdom.

Christ and the Church in the New Covenant raise up holy descendents unto Abraham. Voluntary celibates can by the Holy Spirit add new children to the Kingdom of heaven. According to Isaiah's prophecy (56:5), God promises them a greater honour than sons and daughters according to the flesh, for since the birth of the divine Child no further birth is expected to be an event in the order of salvation. Only the birth from above of new creatures can be decisive.²¹

The force of a word so strong as "eunuch" must imply a permanent (in celibacy condition) or else the comparison has no point. Not even the high expectations in the New Testament of an imminent parousia would make a difference in the institutional character of celibacy. By its evolution it would eventually prove itself to be (in anchorite and cenobitic expression) one of the charismata without which the Church's witness simply would not be complete or, in some cases, even feasible. That is, the celibate's exercise of detachment includes a physical expression by which he becomes free for service of many kinds, a freedom which the married do not have, and, which freedom is "fed back" into the Christian family and the world as a sign of the detachment which must govern every Christian's life. Since in the Kingdom there is neither marriage nor being given in marriage, but rather the joy of being friend to God and prophets, the celibate condition, like marriage at its highest manifestation, is thus a sign of still

another eschatological truth in the Church. Almost by automatic compensation celibates tend toward community, both to emulate Christ and the disciples' example, and to fulfill what I described earlier as the transcendent efficiency which is the gift hoped for from unity in the Holy Spirit. Not surprisingly, religious are often in the vanguard today of those seeking Christian friendship between alienated churches, as at Taizé.

The efficiency of celibate communities is not to be weighed in natural terms, but in terms of justification by faith. The great trials and privileges of that state are known through a calling to those "who can receive it". Prophetic spirituality is apt to be uncomfortable in the quiet and reflection of the communal celibate life, a temptation for the celibate themselves since they know that the world thinks in terms of visible action and visible result, but such reflection, the so-called "good portion", is accepted as by Christ's own sanction. The Celibates constant engagement in "objective" worship also serves to draw him out of himself.

So to regard celibacy also helps to protect lifelong marriage as a vocation, because it exists as an alternative.²² Furthermore, we must remember anachoresis as confrontation in another plane. Thomas Merton, a saintly guilty bystander, is one who so reminds us. Finally, it helps one to understand the man Jesus, for he is thus seen as one who in radical obedience to his mission accepted the kind of lonely detachment (in a world where pornography and exploitation sully sexuality), that celibacy bears when compared to marriage. This is to be preferred to some stupid or lurid speculation that as full God and full man it

would have been awkward for him to marry and leave physical descendants! In the same manner, the man conforming himself to celibacy enters more sympathetically into the life of Christ, the celibate.

C. The effort to lead a chaste life in the Spirit (or better, be led) affects another side of man's emotive make-up, anger. "Be angry but do not sin; do not let the sun go down on your wrath, and give no opportunity to the devil." ²³ Modern psychology has emphasized the need for a responsible expression of anger in the adult, and the disastrous outcome in the individual and those around him when it is mismanaged. Non-violent resistance would seem to be the most mature posture for Christian spirituality as the responsible expression of anger. Non-violence works at many levels of existence, for it depends on love for its foundation, love ^{here} of the same studied yet spontaneous detachment that I am trying to relate to the ascetical style. It requires a strength for suffering, and the openness to hurt which brings the strength characteristic of every relationship from the parental to the romantic, (~~the romantic~~) and in the relationship of enemies, it characterizes the person who chooses a non-violently resistant stance. Punning through all these ties or potential ties is the goal of detachment which "implies the acceptance of a sensibility often deeply wounded. There is no friendship without purifying suffering". ²⁴ Always, this is the theme of friendship as a sacrament of love sustained in detachment.

The non-violent strategy in confronting and unmasking evil on a mission to discover justice and truth is another form of taking up the cross. Erik H. Erikson has found a secular model

for this in comparing the psychoanalyst's exposure to the ambiguities of counter-transference while working therapeutically with his clients, with the non-violent tactics of Gandhi.

Thus - and this is my main point - we are somehow joined in a universal 'therapeutics', committed to the Hippocratic principle that one can test truth (or the healing power inherent in a sick situation) only by action which avoids harm - or better, by action which maximizes mutuality and minimizes the violence caused by unilateral coercion or threat.²⁵

Each strives to maintain a sensibility often deeply wounded but always refreshed by some particular ascetical rigor. For Gandhi this included fasting and celibacy.

We have already seen the major theological importance of King's non-violent method, but it should be re-iterated that he too relied on a detachment through love and self-examination. Thus, whenever jailed, he not infrequently turned to fasting during the first day's imprisonment during a period of self-examination and re-commitment. This too was taking up the cross, bearing the death of Christ in the body so as to have his life also. Non-violence has the scandal of the cross, and with equal embarrassment reminds the black man of the scandal of his ancestors' chains, which the irony of history has made a liberating sign of the times. The anger burning and frustration in the Negro's memory needs an imaginative channel for a righteous release. When the scandal of the chains overwhelms him, it either buries itself in resentful submissiveness - Uncle Tomism - or flies out of control as rage. The scandal of the Cross is applied best through non-violence, though this must become ever more creative as evil forces re-group and make themselves more trenchant as the struggle for power in equity continues in America.

Of course, white America needs to be reminded of its obligations to the same life-style, which duty the war in Vietnam has precipitated anew. That there should be so much evidence of non-violent resistance at Christian beginnings, whether in Jesus' admonition to "turn the other cheek", in his disruptive confrontation with corruption in the temple at Jerusalem, in his Crucifixion, or in the posture of Christian martyrs through the ages, would seem to require an official recognition in modern spirituality. It needs the whole-hearted support of the Church, perhaps through a ceremony of vow and laying-on of hands, in order to help steady the non-violent pledge and recall his baptismal confirmation in the way of all truth as part of his vocation. He thus would rely on the force of Christ's promises to those who suffer for righteousness' sake, and would be a sign to the Church and the world of the peaceable Kingdom. Non-violent resistance certainly has all the earmarks of the ascetical life, as we have seen. It is poverty in those things which the world considers the epitome of riches. It also has a peculiar place in the American democratic legacy, and has been brought to new life by the civil rights movement.

3. The last area that I would suggest - certainly there are more - as an exploratory field for modern spirituality - life in the Spirit - similarly derives from classical inspiration, obedience. It is hard to know what to say about obedience in asceticism during a time when civil disobedience has become a hope for life in a society tantalized by law and order. For the special possibilities of American spirituality relate to the prophetic-holiness category, whose peculiar witness and ethical

thrust it has been the thesis of this essay to draw out. Of course, in the confrontation with evil one can suddenly find himself with a Becket-like call to obedience. To rephrase one poet's line, however, one must admit that the abnormal is not always courage, nor an obedience that is the fruit of much detachment. Obedience is doing the will of someone else, and monasticism, like some forms of marriage and militarism, has fallen guilty in the past of inculcating an obedience which is subservient or infantile. That does not square, somehow, with the dignity for which the Christian should strive as one who is no longer a servant but a friend of his Lord. /6

Noone, though, is exempt from error. Society and culture are also fascinated with extremes of permissiveness. Ordinary prudence has it that two heads are better than one. On the one hand civil disobedience has shown that the best intentions of authority or privilege are not always correct. Sincerity or love is not enough; Justice is greater. On the other hand, life is full of enough head-on encounters, and there are enough natural constraints of freedom that one's finitude leaves him acutely susceptible to correction, either as reprimand or orientation. Stubbornness can blind one to the detachment that he must exercise even toward his own will lest he end up willing his own existence over God's, which is Adam's repeated error. Self-deceit is too easy, even (or maybe especially) when self-examination has been fastidious. Again, it is attention to the Kingdom whose citizens the Spirit is sent to edify, which sheds light on the issue. An acceptance of authority, as obedience is called at Taizé, is the one means of honoring the vigilance of the shepherds Christ has sent in his name with eschatological authority to build up

and not to tear down. And the individual who accepts authority remembers that he is sent on mission with authority. Such authority is no mere hierarchical expression, but requires community-wide support.

Authority must strive to express the highest purpose of the whole body, and to win for each member the fullest expression of his personality... the symbol of sacrifice is not the knife which slays, but the flame which kindles. Obedience... must be a rational and living surrender of one's individual will for the sake of the common life, with the ready humility which thankfully accepts the command of community as the correction of one's own self-will.²⁷

Correction will bring contradiction of our own will and cause pain; obedience is, of course, sacrificial. A nation faced with having to fit itself into a global ecological harmony has to summon much candor to muster the willingness to submit itself to a group will as Fr. Bull suggests in language reminiscent of Rom. 12:1. The exigencies of love and justice will be the sole guardians of so vast an order. Perhaps the root problem is that until we can show an affectionate obedience to one another, we cannot be sure of rendering an authentic obedience to our Lord, least of all unto death.

V. CONCLUSION

When a society is caught in a period of great upheaval, the Christian is under obligation to look to the signs and reflect on the will of God, that is, to wait on the Lord. In a time of change spiritual leadership is above all prophetic, for by such men as God raises up the Holy Spirit addresses the world. One thing that Christians are prone to overlook is that judgement intrudes into the present, and that the Paraclete who will counsel and lead the disciple into the way of all truth and who will accuse the world before the Father, is invisibly at work in the world to hasten and quicken dying processes and visions. With a humility that we mistake for subordination the Spirit reminds us of the words of Christ, and in that anamnestic wave causes hope to well up from downcast hearts, and waters the seed of truth that lies shrivelling in the heart of the world. The roots of seedling truth probe deep in the self until they have split the stone that envelopes men's hearts, setting them free. When men take new heart, they have the capacity for revolution, which a life in the Holy Spirit increases. The world or society which resists that revolution courts its own decline; it courts judgement.

Men hear God from where they are. In a revolution those who have been held at bay through poverty, oppression and death hear a message of liberation from tyranny. Liberation would not be complete, however, if it reached only a mind; the whole, ~~ex-~~ ^{istent} being has to be freed. It is the just expectation of

the oppressed to be clothed with power from on high. For they can no longer wait for the world to evolve toward justice but must confront it with the need for a birth from on high, ^{for} another justice to invade this order. For while their spirits are eager and strain with willingness, they are ultimately the expression of a weak flesh, and are easily spent or misspent. Another Spirit must introduce the re-born into the commerce of the Heavenly City, endowing them with a powerful enterprise and lending them the inexhaustible treasures of holiness, to hold in perpetuity. Asceticism, or exercise in the Holy Spirit, is a natural response in one who wants to fight the good fight, to win in the race, and is the means of growing in aptness for holiness. Men can never be naturally holy, but can increase their aptness for it by keeping in order the dwelling of the Spirit, that the world may see the light, Kingdom, power and glory of God/holiness.

Obviously, revolution is ultimately a spiritual reality. One hesitates to use a current word in a period of inflation. Yet spirituality in America demonstrates that society and self are inseparables, a solidarity, and when a revolution occurs in either it affects the other. It points to the vision of individual moral excellence and social justice. This is a high time in American history, and its sign is the rise of the black man up from slavery. It is his emergence from the wilderness and the entrance into Canaan. Ascetical struggle has a long history whose character I have tried to evoke, showing that it is the black man's privilege at this hour, especially in the figure of Martin King, to sum that history up and extend it. Others must follow, disarming themselves by a detachment in the Spirit to become poor, obedient

and chaste, to rejoice in the midst of suffering, to give thanks
for the foretaste of what is to come: that by the ^{Holy} Spirit of
wisdom dwelling in all our hearts, we are made friends of God and
prophets, to glorify and enjoy him in their company forever.

Notes to Chapter Three

¹Rom. 8:28 (RSV).

²Bull, The Revival of the Religious Life (cit. supra); p. 28f.

³King, Where Do We Go from Here?, p. 42f et passim. For a strikingly similar definition see Hannah Arendt's article in the New York Review of Books, Feb. 27, 1969, especially her demonstration of how modern warfare tools have an efficiency that makes numbers irrelevant, though in underdeveloped areas the same are a hindrance. This fore-shadows "another reversal in the future relationship between small and great powers... Power cannot be measured by wealth, (and) an abundance of wealth may erode power..." p. 19.

⁴Denis Goulet, "The Disappointing Decade of Development," The Center Magazine, Sept., 1969; p. 63.

⁵Ibid.

⁶II Cor. 12:9 (RSV).

⁷Bull, op. cit., p. 211.

⁸See Richardson, "Holy Spirit in Protestantism," (cit. supra), p. 192f, and Berkhof, The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, p. 10.

⁹Cf. Gal. 4:26, II Cor. 11:2, where the feminine imagery is important. This is one place where I think piety is within rights to honor Mary as a type of the Kingdom, as the Fourth Gospel seems to imply at the foot of the cross, and Luke in the Infancy Narrative and opening of Acts. Mary is pre-eminent more than she is unique.

¹⁰Quispel, "Jewish Christianity," feels that "Our interpretation of the dogma of the Trinity is involved. Kretschmar has shown that the concept of the Trinity is not just the product of Hellenistic thought, but that this doctrine has its roots in Jewish Christianity. On the other hand it is perfectly clear that the Jewish Christian and the Syrian view was very different from the classical formulation of the trinitarian dogma. They admitted three divine persons, but one of them was a female. What strikes me most is that some of our Russian friends have not the slightest difficulties in integrating these findings. They commonly stress that the Holy Spirit represents the tender, almost feminine aspects of God. And therefore they consider the Virgin Mary as the personal revelation and symbol of the Holy Ghost." P. 91.

¹¹Viz., George Mendenhall on the Covenant and the Conquest, which in the new light would appear to be indeed the stormy and precipitate affair that Joshua and Judges suggest, but with a twist. Von Rad heads the school of assimilationist views. Cf. Mendenhall, "Law and the Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East," The Biblical Colloquium, 1955.

¹²See H.H. Rowley's summary of the shift in prophetic studies in "The Nature of Old Testament Prophecy in the Light of Recent Study," in The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays, London; 1952; and the study by R.E. Clements, Prophecy and Covenant, London, 1965.

¹³Hans-Joachim Kraus, Worship in Israel, Richmond, 1966; p. 111. I personally feel that this passage shares more the parenetic function of the rest of Deuteronomy, as stressed by von Rad.

¹⁴Or, as Quispel says of the historical side, "Moreover, there is the issue of asceticism. Owing to the exertions of Voobus many scholars now think that Syrian asceticism is independent of and prior to the monasticism of the Roman Empire. There is something strangely Jewish about the Syrian Sons of the Covenant. It has been pointed out that

monk, monachos, is a translation of the Syrian ihidājā, bachelor; and this in its turn is supposed to derive from the Hebrew word jahid, bachelor. So the word 'monk' would reveal the Jewish Christian origin in a nutshell. If this is true, must not we then consider asceticism as a legitimate offspring of primitive Christianity, which preserves its value even today? This is no popular speech in a welfare state. But scholarship is not concerned about topicality and has to say that historically speaking, asceticism is an essential part of the Christian religion." Op. Cit., p. 89.

¹⁵Goulet, op. cit., p. 64-65. Fr. Bull wrote the following in 1914: "The primary aim of Religious Poverty is not edification, but freedom. But poverty with stern simplicity of life undoubtedly helps those who work among the poor by increase of sympathy. It is a useful protest against false economic theories. It is true as economists maintain, that primitive man can only be redeemed by increasing his wants, and multiplying his desires, for this increase stimulates the undeveloped to the physical labor and mental discipline which are necessary to his development. But at a certain point of a man's education this ceases to be true. At a certain point the continued multiplication of desire only dissipates force; and all further progress depends on the unification of desire into a righteous will." Op. cit., p. 179.

¹⁶See Roger Schutz' Living Today for God, Baltimore, 1960, on the community of goods: "Those who profess the common life are not thereby exempt from concern for their daily bread, above all if they live solely by their labor. They know that there is a long way between the teaching 'sufficient for the day' and its application. Possessing goods in common takes on its true value only if we live in the boldness of God-bearing all hardships together, living if necessary in the most miserable of dwellings, and if no resources are available, persevering in our mission despite poverty." P. 107.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 111.

¹⁸I Cor. 7:1-7.

¹⁹I Cor. 7:7; Rom. 11:29.

²⁰See Luke's Gospel, which adds the "wife", 14:26; and Matt. 19:12.

²¹Max Thurian, Marriage and Celibate, London, 1959, p. 44.

²²Luke 10:42.

²³The Taizé theologians, Schutz and Thurian, both elaborate this vocational character of marriage as found in Karl Barth's Church Dogmatic. Cf. Thurian, op. cit., p. 85 et passim.

²⁴Eph. 4:26, Ps. 4:4.

²⁵The Rule of Taizé, Taizé, 1967.

²⁶Erikson, Gandhi's Truth: on the Origins of Nonviolence, N.Y., 1968, p. 247.

²⁷Bull, op. cit., p. 206.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. General

- Bennett, Lerone, Jr., What Manner of Man? a memorial biography of Martin Luther King, Jr., New York; Pocket Books; 1968 (abridged).
- Bettelheim, Bruno, The Informed Heart, New York; The Free Press; 1960.
- Bull, Paul, C.R., The Revival of the Religious Life, London, Arnold; 1914.
- Gandhi, Mohandas K., Autobiography, the Story of My Experiments with Truth, transl. Desai, Washington, D.C.; Public Affairs.
- _____, Non-Violent Resistance (Satyagraha), New York, Schocken Brothers; 1961.
- Goulet, Denis, "The Disappointing Decade of Development", The Center Magazine, Sept., 1969.
- _____, "On the Goals of Development", Cross Currents, Vol. XVIII, No. 4; Fall, 1968; p. 387.
- Schutz, Roger, Living Today for God, Baltimore, Helicon Press; 1960.
- _____, The Rule of Taizé, Taizé; Les Presses de Taizé; 1967.
- Teilhard de Chardin, Pierre, The Phenomenon of Man, transl. Wall, London-New York; Harper and Row; 1959.

II. Exegesis

- Barrett, C.K., The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition, London; S.P.C.K.; 1947.
- Sjoberg, E., Schweitzer, Edvard, "Pneuma", article in The Theological Wordbook of the New Testament, ed. Kittel, Grand Rapids; Eerdmans; 1968. Vol. VI.

III. History

- Chadwick, Owen, ed. and transl., Western Asceticism, Library of Christian Classics, Vol. 12, Philadelphia; Westminster; 1958. This volume contains the Sayings of the Fathers, the Conferences of Cassian, and the Regula of S. Benedict.
- Cross, F.M., The Ancient Library of Qumran, Garden City; Doubleday Anchor; 1961, 1958.
- Danielou, Jean, S.J., The Theology of Jewish Christianity, transl., ed. John A. Baker, Chicago; Henry Regnery Company; 1964. Vol. I.
- Dupont-Sommer, A., The Essene Writings of Qumran, transl. Blackwell, New York; Meridian; 1962.
- Frend, W.H.C., Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church; a study of conflict from the Maccabees to Donatus; Oxford; Blackwell; 1965.
- Lietzmann, Hans, The Era of the Church Fathers, Vol. IV; London; Lutterwort; 1951.
- Mason, A.J., ed., transl., Fifty Homilies of S. Macarius of Egypt; London, New York; Longman's; 1921.
- Quispel, Gilles, "On Jewish Christianity", Vigiliae Christianae, Vol. 22, 1968; p. 81.
- Schoeps, Hans Joachim, Jewish Christianity; factional disputes in the early Church, transl. Douglas Hare, Philadelphia; Fortress Press; 1969.
- Kelly, J.N.D., Early Christian Doctrines, New York; Harper; 1968.

IV. Theology

- Benson, Richard M., S.S.J.E., The Virgin Birth of Our Lord, Jesus Christ, The Foundation of the Christian Religion, reprint from The Church Eclectic, Utica, N.Y., 1921.
- Berkhof, Hendrikus, The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, Richmond; John Knox Press; 1964.
- Cone, James, Black Power and Black Theology, New York; Seabury; 1969.
- King, Martin Luther, Jr., Stride toward Freedom, the Montgomery story, New York; Harper & Row (Perennial Library); 1958.
- _____, "A Testament of Hope", Playboy, Vol. 15, No.1, 1970; p. 1 .
- _____, The Trumpet of Conscience, New York; Harper & Row; 1968, 1967.
- _____, Where Do We Go from Here: chaos or community?, New York, Harper & Row (in Bantam paperback edition); 1967.
- _____, Why We Can't Wait, New York; Harper; 1964.
- Outler, Albert, "Veni, Creator Spiritus: the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit", The New Theology, No. 4, ed. Marty and Peerman, New York; the MacMillan Company; 1967; p. 195.
- _____, and
Richardson, Herbert W., "Holy Spirit in Protestantism", Commonweal, Nov. 8, 1968; p. 193.
- _____, "Martin Luther King, Jr., As Theologian", New Theology, No. 6, ed. Marty and Peerman; New York; the MacMillan Company; 1969.
- _____, Toward an American Theology, New York; Harper & Row; 1967.
- Merton, Thomas, Contemplative Prayer, New York; Herder and Herder; 1969.
- _____, Seeds of Destruction, New York; the MacMillan Company; 1967.